

The University of Chicago

NEW MATERIAL ON THE DRAMATIC
TREATMENT OF PETER THE CRUEL OF
CASTILE AND THE DIFFUSION OF THE
LEGEND IN FRANCE, GERMANY,
AND ENGLAND

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

1932

By
EMILY SCHONS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1936

The University of Chicago

NEW MATERIAL ON THE DRAMATIC
TREATMENT OF PETER THE CRUEL OF
CASTILE AND THE DIFFUSION OF THE
LEGEND IN FRANCE, GERMANY,
AND ENGLAND

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

1932

By
EMILY SCHONS

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1936



CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Part I	
Don Pedro in Spanish Drama	
The Popularity of the Don Pedro Legend.....	4
A Reconsideration of the Sources of Seventeenth	
Century Don Pedro Drama.....	6
Lope de Vega's Audiencias del Rey Don Pedro	
and Gracia Dei.....	7
Los Ramírez de Arellano and Mariana.....	11
Other Don Pedro Plays.....	15
Zorrilla and Mariana.....	16
Don Pedro as El Justiciero.....	18
Spanish Don Pedro Plays not identified or not	
mentioned by Lomba y Pedraja.....	22
An Anonymous Doña Blanca de Borbón.....	23
The Duque de Rivas' Doña Blanca de Castilla.....	24
La Crueldad en el Throno.....	25
Francisco Villaespesa's Doña María de Padilla.....	36
Part II	
Don Pedro in French Drama	
The Seventeenth Century.....	44
Regnault's Blanche de Bourbon.....	44
The Eighteenth Century.....	53
Voltaire's Don Pèdre.....	54
De Belloy's Pierre le Cruel.....	55
Arnault's Don Pèdre ou Le roi et le laboureur.....	57
The Nineteenth Century.....	64
Epoch of Mélodrame — Labrousse and Saint-Ernest's Don	

	Page
Père le Mèdiant.....	66
Later Period — Common and Grangé's Don Père.....	74
Conclusion.....	77

Part III

German Don Pedro Drama

Grillparzer's Blanka von Kastilien.....	79
F. Ismar's König Pedro.....	89

Part IV

Don Pedro in English Drama

Mrs. Attersoll's Peter the Cruel.....	97
Lord Porchester's Don Pedro, King of Castile.....	100
Conclusion.....	106
Bibliography.....	109
Appendix.....	114

PREFACE

I wish to express my sincere thanks to Professor George T. Northup of the University of Chicago for his guidance and encouragement in the preparation of this dissertation. He has been ever ready with expert advice and kindly suggestion. I am also indebted to Professor Hayward Keniston for much valuable help; to my sister, Miss Dorothy Schons for a Spanish Don Pedro play; to Miss Marie Davis and Mrs. Dorothy Porter Cummings for procuring for me certain foreign photostats. My heartfelt gratitude is offered to them all. For the shortcomings of the work I am alone responsible.

E. S.

St. Paul, Minn.
May 12, 1932.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41548411_0072

NEW MATERIAL ON THE DRAMATIC TREATMENT OF PETER THE
CRUEL OF CASTILE AND THE DIFFUSION OF THE LEGEND
IN FRANCE, GERMANY AND ENGLAND

INTRODUCTION

José R. Lomba y Pedraja in 1899 published a study entitled El Rey Don Pedro en el teatro.¹ So masterly was Señor Lomba's treatment of the matter, that little has since been added to it, and only the fact that a number of plays have reached my hands which present phases of the Don Pedro legend not touched upon in any of those discussed by him or which show the diffusion of the legend beyond the confines of Spain justifies me in re-opening the subject.

Lomba, judging from the Don Pedro plays he had examined, came to the conclusion that the drama had not concerned itself with certain of the legendary materials that had grown up about the name of Peter the Cruel in popular tradition but had drawn chiefly from historical sources; that it had ignored such traditional elements as the liaison between the queen and the Master of Santiago (or had presented it as a false accusation) and the bewitching of the king by means of a magic girdle. The first of these traditions, though by no means prominent in the Spanish drama, does exist, while the second one, ignored by the Spanish theater, appears in the French, and it may be that a consideration of the plays in which these legends occur may not be devoid of interest.

¹Homenaje a Menéndez y Pelayo, (Madrid, 1899), II, 257-339.

It is profitable to consider to just what extent dramatists, not only in France, but in other countries, interested themselves in this subject, even if their plays, for the most part, were not inspired by the Spanish drama, but were due to the general interest in historical subjects and were based on historical sources.

The first part of this study will therefore deal with new material on the treatment of Peter the Cruel in the Spanish drama, together with a reconsideration of the sources of some of the already-known plays and such facts as have appeared at intervals since the publication of Señor Lomba's article. This will be followed by a survey of the rôle played by Don Pedro in the drama of France, Germany and England.

PART I

DON PEDRO IN SPANISH DRAMA

THE POPULARITY OF THE DON PEDRO LEGEND

Don Pedro el Cruel or el Justiciero, who came to the Castilian throne as a mere boy in the middle of the fourteenth century, is one of the most picturesque figures of Spanish legend. In popular appeal he perhaps comes next to the Cid and Don Juan. Indeed, what Hartzenbusch said of Don Pedro as he appears in El Infanzón de Illescas and to which Menéndez y Pelayo rightly takes exception¹ when applied to this particular play, can with a great measure of truth be said of one phase of his legendary entity. He is a sort of Don Juan. He possesses the two characteristics — the one a virtue — the other a vice — that set apart the Burlador de Sevilla, courage and amativeness. The second of these traits is expressed by his chronicler, López de Ayala, in these words: amaba mucho mujeres.² For many were the women who during the short period of Don Pedro's life — he died at the age of thirty-five — successively possessed his fickle heart. But while many of these women only survive in the dust of old archives, there is one who seems still alive today, haunting the Moorish halls of the old Alcázar in Seville, gliding about its lovely gardens. Her name is María de Padilla, the woman to whom Don Pedro always returned when each brief infatuation for some other beauty ended. Again and again dramatists have pictured Don Pedro as a young gallant at the window of some rustic belle

¹Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega, (Madrid, 1923 ed.), IV, 369.

²"Crónica del Rey Don Pedro," Biblioteca de autores españoles, (Madrid, 1846-1880), LXVI, Año 20, Cap.8.

or crossing swords with a rival before the reja of some lady of the court. He is usually portrayed as a fine swordsman and more than a match for any opponent, however skillful. To make still greater the analogy between Don Pedro and Don Juan, the fourteenth century king, too, is accused of trying to steal a nun from her convent.¹

Yet this is only one side of the Don Pedro legend. Another equally romantic aspect of it depicts him prowling incognito about the streets of Seville at night, seeing for himself that the laws are obeyed, making sure that no rico-hombre avail himself of his power to oppress the weak and helpless. Or we see him sitting on his lofty seat before the gates of the Alcázar, dispensing justice in true Oriental fashion.

Then there is the less pleasing picture which shows him wreaking a bloody vengeance on his rebellious, or as some would have it, adulterous brother, Don Fadrique, Maestre de Santiago. In the Alcázar, they still point out the stain on the stone tiling, supposedly made by the Maestre's blood as the ballesteros scattered his brains with the blows of their maces.

And most sinister of all, is the story of beautiful young Blanche of Bourbon, brought from France as Don Pedro's bride, only to drag out nine years in prison and then die a miserable death, either at the hand of an executioner or because the weight of her sorrows had become too heavy for her to bear it any longer. This last is the phase of the Don Pedro legend that most appealed to the Neo-Classic dramatists, simply because the laws of French Classical tragedy, which they did their best to follow, require an innocent victim of a cruel Fate. Voltaire, to be sure, attained

¹In the María Coronel incident.

the same result by presenting Don Pedro as the victim of Enrique, the bastard brother who robbed him at the same time of his life and his crown. However, Blanca more naturally fits into the role of persecuted innocence, and to her the Neo-Classicists usually assigned it.

Last comes the dramatic scene at Montiel, where two brothers fought out the destinies of a nation and settled a dynasty in a bloody hand-to-hand conflict. This climax to Don Pedro's stormy career, with its prophecies and portents, appealed to seventeenth century and Romantic dramatists alike.

II

A RECONSIDERATION OF THE SOURCES OF SEVENTEENTH CENTURY DON PEDRO DRAMA

While Lomba is undoubtedly right in considering Ayala as the foundation of Don Pedro drama in general, I am inclined to doubt that the majority of the seventeenth century dramatists who treated the subject had any direct, first-hand acquaintance with him. Lope de Vega shows unmistakable signs of having used him in Los Ramírez de Arellano and Audiencias del Rey Don Pedro. But Lope was an exceptional person, a fénix de los ingenios whose interests were all-embracing and who studied not only the life of his own time but the historical past as well. His interest in history is shown by the great number of his plays which deal with historical subjects. And like other great dramatists of the world who have written plays around historical personages, he documented himself well, even though he was not always historically accurate. But the majority of dramatists who treated the subject of Don Pedro in the seventeenth century probably contented themselves with a perfunctory glance at Mariana or relied entirely on their

own memory and fancy for inspiration.

Whether the romances viejos were based on the chronicles, as Milá and Menéndez y Pelayo believed, or whether in many cases the ballads were the source of the chronicles, as Menéndez Pidal, Cirot and Entwistle maintain, it is certain that Ayala's popularity waned after the sixteenth century. This is indisputably attested by the editions we have of his work. There were four in the sixteenth century, then none at all between 1591 and 1779, a significant indication. During almost two centuries not a single new edition! In approximately the same period there were published seventeen editions of Mariana. Authors, to be sure, had access to the old copies of Ayala in the libraries, but few dramatists are at the same time research workers. The majority seek their material in the most convenient places. And the most accessible place was undoubtedly Mariana. Most of the seventeenth century Don Pedro plays show such slight historical details that it is impossible to determine what is their source. However, it is in most cases pretty safe to assume that it is not Ayala, for it seems inconceivable that a dramatist who had read Ayala would neglect to avail himself of at least some of the countless picturesque details related by him and which would have been at least as effective as the more or less fantastic inventions of the dramatist himself.

Lope de Vega's Audiencias del Rey Don Pedro
and Gracia Dei

Lope had read widely on the subject of Don Pedro. He seems to have been familiar with Mariana as well as Ayala and the Cuarta Crónica General, either directly or in the compilation

known as Gracia Dei.¹ His wide reading shows itself especially in Audiencias del Rey Don Pedro, which existed only in manuscript form at the time Señor Lomba's article was published, but which has since appeared under the auspices of the Spanish Academy.² In it, as Señor Lomba indicates,³ Lope drew on the Cuarta Crónica General for the account which Don Diego gives of Don Pedro's imprisonment at Toro and his escape, accompanied by his bastard brother, Don Tello. Ayala states that Simuel el Levi, Don Pedro's treasurer, went with him.⁴ Mariana evidently combined these two accounts, for he mentions both Don Tello and Simuel in this connection.⁵ It is a curious circumstance that Lope represents Don Pedro's incarceration at Toro as having lasted four years when the Cuarta Crónica states distinctly that its duration was three years.⁶ Perhaps the explanation may be found in the statement of the prologue to the compilation that goes by the name of Gracia Dei, which contains numerous citations from the Cuarta Crónica General:

"Duró esto cuatro años, que dicen que el Rey D. Pedro en este tiempo se andaba holgando por el Regno con sus hermanos: así lo refiere el Despensero mayor, y Pedro Vilano, Historiador de aquel tiempo. Y quando sus hermanos so color de buena fé, y a traicion prendieron en Toro el Rey Don Pedro, tres años le tuvieron preso."⁷

Lope may have confused the two periods of time. Gracia Dei's

¹Published in Semanario erudito, (Madrid, 1788), XXVIII and XXIX.

²Obras de Lope de Vega, (Madrid, 1899), IX.

³Op.cit., 259 ff.

⁴Año 5, Cap. 8.

⁵"Historia de España," B.A.E., XXX, Libro 16, Cap. 20.

⁶Version of the Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España, CVI, 75.

⁷Semanario Erudito, XXVIII, 227. Zurita in his Prologue to the Chronicle of Ayala had already called attention to the fact that the author of the Cuarta Crónica or the Compendio, as he calls it, was wrong in this detail, Don Pedro having remained at Toro less than three months (Extracts from the "Compendio," B.A.E., LXVI, 603).

attempt at a vindication of Don Pedro may, in fact, have had not a little to do with the favorable treatment of that personage by the dramatists of the seventeenth century. The theater was apparently carried away by the prevailing tendency of the Century to clear the memory of Don Pedro, while the romances, composed in a previous epoch, reflect the earlier attitude toward him.

In Act I of the Audiencias del Rey Don Pedro we have perhaps another indication that Lope may have read Gracia Dei. Here Don Diego says:

"Por muerte del rey Alfonso
Y ser don Pedro tan niño,
Tomó a su cargo el gobierno
Del reino su hermano Enrico
Y como señor supremo,
Daba cargos, daba oficios,
Procurando de esta suerte
Ser más amado y bienquisto.
Vídose con el gobierno
Don Pedro muy oprimido,
Acrecentando temores
Su altivez, valor y bríos.
.....
Sus allegados y amigos,
Le aconsejaron reinase,
Pues Rey de España le hizo
El cielo. Indignado el Conde,
Se mostró muy ofendido,
Y don Tello y don Fadrique,
Orgullosos y atrevidos,
Fueron a Toro," etc.

Gracia Dei says on this point:

"Muerto pues el Rey Don Alonso, sucedió en el Reyno su hijo el Rey Don Pedro... Y como estos sus hermanos fuesen ya hombres, y apoderados (como está dicho) en el Reyno, y el Rey Don Pedro mozo, empezaron a señorearse de él, continuando todavía la costumbre que tenían de mandar, y gobernar en vida del Rey Don Alonso su padre; y aun entonces lo hacían con mas libertad y osadía que antes; y así pusieron casa al Rey Don Pedro, repartiendo entre sí y sus aliados los mejores cargos, y oficios de ella en mando y provecho: de manera que al Rey solo le dexaban el nombre de Rey...

Quando el Rey fue mas hombre, no pudiendo ya sufrir la tiranía, y mando que sus hermanos sobre él tenían, procuró poner alguna resistencia a sus cosas yendoles a la mano en ellas, y ellos no pudiendo dexar de continuar su costumbre, comenzaron a amotinarse contra el Rey..."¹

¹Op.cit., p. 233.

Then follows the account of the Toro affair. Lope simply attributes the regency to the one brother, while Gracia Dei speaks of it as belonging to the whole family.

As Menéndez y Pelayo suggests,¹ Lope might have taken both the version of the escape from Toro and the Rey Bermejo incident from the Gracia Dei compilation rather than from the Cuarta Crónica General directly. Indeed, the circumstance that in Don Pedro's invitation to the Moorish king, he substitutes Don Juan, the supposed son of Juana de Castro, for the son of María de Padilla makes it quite likely that the first was his source, for in it we find a detailed account of Don Juan's descendants.² Don Pedro says in the Audiencias:

"Los del Consejo junté,
Y viendo su alevosía,
Sin nombre de tiranía,
Acordaron que le dé
Seguro, y venga a Sevilla
Al bautismo de don Juan." (Act II)

The Cuarta Crónica version, included in Gracia Dei is:

"E dende a poco acaeció que le nació al rey don Pedro un fijo de doña María de Padilla en Sevilla. E embió convidar al rey Bermejo que viniese a las fiestas que avía de facer por el nacimiento de su fijo e a ser su compadre. E el rey Bermejo dixo que le placía, pero que le embiase su seguro; e el rey don Pedro gelo embió, y luego se vino este rey Bermejo para Sevilla..."³

María de Padilla's son was historically Don Alfonso, who died at an early age, according to Ayala.⁴ There is not a word about Don Juan either in the Cuarta Crónica or in Ayala. The former, in fact, does not even mention the mother, Juana de Castro, to marry whom Don Pedro braved the Pope himself, only to forsake her the

¹Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega, (1923 ed.), IV, 354.

²Op.cit., pp. 253 ff.

³Serenario Erudito, XXIX, 6.

⁴Año 13, Cap. 14.

day after the marriage. Ayala, while giving all the details of the marriage to Juana, says nothing of a son being born to her.¹ Mariana² and Julián del Castillo³ merely mention him in passing and omit the other details utilized by Lope.

Los Ramírez de Arellano and Mariana

The chief source of Lope's Los Ramírez de Arellano, a genealogy play, is without doubt Ayala.⁴ It was natural that Lope should have looked there for his material in this case, for none of the briefer accounts of Don Pedro's reign could give more than passing mention to an individual who was after all of rather limited historical importance. However, there are indications that other sources were also utilized. In the Montiel scene,⁵ while there are details which point to Ayala, there is an important difference. Ayala, to be sure, accuses Du Guesclin of treachery, but at the same time, gives Enrique credit for killing his brother by his own unaided efforts after the two are once in each other's clutches.⁶ Lope's account, on the other hand, speaks of the help given by the Breton leader,⁷ omitting, however, the famous words: ni quito ni pongo Rey, pero ayudo a mi señor.

¹Año 5, Cap. 10.

²Libro 16, Cap. 18.

³Historia de los reyes godos, (Madrid, 1624 ed.), p. 272.

⁴Lomba, op.cit., p. 260.

⁵Act III.

⁶Año 20, Cap. 8.

⁷Lomba states: "Nada dice Lope en Los Ramírez de Arellano ni de la ayuda que Beltrán prestó a D.Enrique, poniéndole encima de su hermano..." While Lope does not say just how Du Guesclin aided Enrique, it seems to me he means to imply that he did help him after they came to blows when he says:

"mas, siendo Enrique avisado
sacó la daga é hirióle,
cayendo en el suelo entrambos,
donde dicen que fué Enrique
de don Beltrán ayudado."

Mariana also gives the act without the phrase. Then he goes on to point a moral, as is his wont: "...cosa que pone grima. Un Rey, hijo y nieto de reyes, revolcado en su sangre derramada por la mano de un su hermano bastardo." If a part of Lope's romance was popular, as both Lomba and Menéndez y Pelayo¹ believe, we have here an instance where a late historical account quotes from a popular ballad. The romance in question is:

"Muerto yace el Rey Don Pedro
en su sangre revolcado:
mas enemigos que amigos
tienen su cuerpo cercado:
unos dicen que le entierren
otros que no sea enterrado."

The romance in Part III of the Silva de varios romances which Restori suggests as an imperfect fragment of the one used by Lope² does not contain the words en su sangre revolcado. It, however, has the first line of Lope's. Claramonte's also has the line inverted by Mariana:

".....
muerto yace el Rey D. Pedro
en su sangre revolcado.
Los pies tiene Enrique
sobre su cuerpo gallardo,
y el puñal sangriento tiene
en su vengadora mano."³

It might perhaps also be argued that Lope had himself composed his romance, merely adopting a line from the one in the Silve and another from Mariana.

The Sources of Claramonte

El Rey Don Pedro en Madrid o el Infanzón de Illescas in the version of the Osuna Ms., published by the Academy,⁴ and

¹Op.cit., p. 408.

²Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, (1905), XXIX, 128.
The romance is reprinted in Menéndez y Pelayo, Antología, IX, 193.

³Deste agua no beberé, Act III.

⁴Obras de Lope de Vega, IX.

which Menéndez y Pelayo considers the most authentic form of Lope's play, has no historical details except the picture of Don Pedro as Justiciero. However, in the version which corresponds in the main with that which Hartzenbusch printed among the works of Tirso de Molina, a scene has been substituted for the first appearance of the Sombra¹ and at the end of this scene we find the statement that Fadrique had gone to France (presumably to act as Blanca's escort). The fact that the verses substituted contain this statement may indicate that they were not added by the publisher, as Menéndez y Pelayo believed,² but were actually written by Claramonte. For that author makes the same assertion in Deste agua no beberé.³ Claramonte's authority for this belief was probably Mariana. The less-known Julián del Castillo and Caro de Torres also state the circumstance as a fact, as do too most of Don Pedro's apologists. But the greater popularity of Mariana would probably point to the famous Jesuit historian as the source of this statement.⁴ In no other of Lope's known Don Pedro plays is such an assertion made, and critical historians have constantly denied the truth of such a supposition. Claramonte doubtless felt that Don Fadrique's going to France, suggesting as it did the whole novelistic story of his and Blanca's guilty love, would heighten the dramatic effect of both plays.⁵

¹Act I.

²Estudios, p. 400.

³Act I.

⁴Mariana explains carefully that he gives no credence to the current rumors of an illicit relationship between Fadrique and Blanca (Libro 16, Cap. 18) and yet mentions the bride's arrival, accompanied by the Maestre — que la salió a recibir — (Libro 16, Cap. 17) as a historical fact.

⁵This one statement, slight as it is, may at the same time offer another bit of evidence to support Menéndez y Pelayo's theory (op.cit., p. 399) against Restorff's (Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, (1905), XXIX, 105 ff.) that the Osuna Ms. is in fact the most authentic version of the play that was Lope's.

The dragon incident¹ which occurs at Montiel may have been inspired by the Torre de la Estrella, mentioned by Mariana,² for while the one dragon falls to pieces, the other rises and is converted into una estrella tan clara como el sol. Juan de Mal-Lara tells of a similar effect produced by fire-works near the Alcázar of Seville to celebrate the visit of Philip II in 1569 and which was believed by the vulgo to be a supernatural occurrence and later interpreted as an augury foretelling the end of the Turkish power in Europe. In that account there is only one dragon.³ Claramonte has two:

"Dos fieros dragones,
de un arrebatado fuego,
despartiendo de la escama
piedras como el Mongibelo,
el uno al otro enlazados
sobre la tierra cayeron:
el uno impensadamente
despedazado y deshecho
cayo, volviéndose el otro
a levantar por los vientos,
donde, cercado de luz,
todos convertirle vieron
en una estrella tan clara
como el sol."

Mal-Lara's account or his own presence at the celebration may have given Claramonte an idea for explaining the peculiar name of the tower at Montiel. Mal-Lara describes the Fuegos in these words:

"Bien junto a ella [the huerta near the Alcázar] llegaua su M ya que la noche escurescía, y trayan por orden de la ciudad muchas hachas, quando por el ayre se oyo un espantoso trueno, y tras del boluiendo todos los ojos, se vieron muchas formas de relampagos, rayos y tronadores, que de muy alto descendian, por la parte que la torre haze una fuente al Alcázar, començo a arder un dragon grandissimo, que con escamas verdes, las alas tendidas y la cola enroscada ardía brauamente esparziendo por cima de todas aquellas casas de los vezinos

¹Desto agua no beberé, Act III.

²Libro 17, Cap. 13.

³Recibimiento que hizo Sevilla al Rey D. Philipe, (Seville, 1570), p. 179.

grande copia de Boladores fenesciendo cada uno su braueza en rezio sonido. Era marauilla ver la braueza de el dragon, que assi entero sin en algo deshazersé despedia por la boca abundantemente fuego y rayos. Boluiase a unas partes y a otras dando diferentes muestras de furiosas arremetidas, hasta que unas ruedas que stauan sobre las alas se asieron en fuego, y començaron a dar grandes vueltas con toda la velocidad, que la vista humana puede alcançar, aunque entrasse en ella la fabulosa de Lynceo el Argonauta. Reboluiendose unas sobre otras, y como estuuiesen atados, y tan cerca, era una hermosa batalla la que el rechinar del uno formaua en el arder del otro, donde llamas y estruendo combatian metiendose unas por otras acabandose con su mesma furia indignados en yqual poder. Fue esto la causa de dar fin al Dragon..."

Mal-Lara and Claramonte both depict the terror of the people at the strange apparition and their feeling that it prophesied dire events.¹

Other Don Pedro Plays

Pérez de Montalván in La Puerta Macarena and Hoz y Mota in El Montañés Juan Pascual also present Fadrique in the rôle of Blanca's escort and yet do not allege a guilty love, indicating perhaps that they too were influenced by Mariana. Montalván, to be sure, also shows details that point to the Cuarta Crónica.² Calderón in his refundición of El Médico de su honra, Alarcón in Ganar amigos, Moreto in his re-working of El Infanzón de Illescas and Enríquez Gómez in A lo que obliga el honor give no details which would indicate any familiarity with Ayala. Cañizares may have read him, but be that as it may, he also gives Mariana's version of the Montiel episode, accusing Du Guesclin of helping Enrique in the death struggle with his brother. He adds to Mariana's account the well-known phrase in a slightly altered form:

"Ni hago ni deshago Rey, que yo
Ayudo al dueño que ensalzo."³

¹Lope drew on Mal-Lara's description of these festivals for his Vitoria de la Honra.

²Lomba, op.cit., p.279, note.

³Act III. Romance, Durán, 978, attributes the deed and

The Cuarta Crónica General lays the responsibility for the action on Du Guesclin "e otros que ende estauan."¹

III

ZORRILLA AND MARIANA

In nineteenth century Spain too Mariana was a source of Don Pedro drama. Zorrilla owed him not a little. We know from his own testimony that he considered Mariana as a convenient source book for the dramatist who wished to treat a historical subject. What is more familiar than the well-known incident where Zorrilla, after trying in vain to induce Hartzenbusch to find him a subject, makes a final proposition to the manager of the Teatro de la Cruz?

"Traiga usted aquí el dieciséis por la noche un ejemplar de la historia del P.Mariana; le abriremos por tres partes, desde la época de los godos hasta la de Felipe IV; leeremos tres hojas de cada corte en sus hojas hecho; y si en las nueve que leamos tropezamos con algo que nos dé luz para un asunto dramático, lo amasaremos entre todos, yo lo escribiré como Dios me dé a entender, y el jesuita Mariana abonará la fe del discípulo de los Jesuitas del Semanario de Nobles."²

The manager does as requested, and twenty-four hours later the one-act play, El Puñal del Godo, is ready. Zorrilla does not tell what was the source of El zapatero y el Rey. Lomba suggests that it was Ayala, but internal evidence indicates that Zorrilla used in addition the Historia de España of Mariana. In Part II, Act III, Sc. III there is mention of a torre de la Estrella at Mon-

words of similar import to a page:

"No quito Rey
Ni pongo Rey de mi mano,
Pero hago lo que debo
Al oficio de criado."

¹Op.cit., p. 97. For a discussion of the history of the phrase, see Lomba, op.cit., pp. 336 ff.

²Recuerdos del tiempo viejo, (Madrid, 1882), I, 92 ff.

tiel, already referred to, which points not to Ayala but to Mariana, where we read:

"El recelo y temor que tenia dicen se le aumentó un letreiro que leyó poco antes, escrito en la pared de la torre del omenaje del castillo de Montiel, que contenia estas palabras: «esta es la torre de la Estrella». Ca ciertos astrólogos le pronosticaron que moriria en una torre deste nombre."¹

Mariana's source in turn is the Cuarta Crónica General.² I conclude that Zorrilla used Mariana rather than the Cuarta Crónica because other details present in Zorrilla and Mariana are lacking in the Cuarta Crónica. The name of the Moorish astrologer who foretells Don Pedro's death in El Zapatero y el Rey is Ben Hagatín. Zorrilla, feeling that Ben was a title, wrote Mariana's Benagatin in two parts and supplied the H. Ayala has Benahatin. Moreover, in Ayala, the Moor merely sends Don Pedro a letter of good counsel and is not consulted in person as in Zorrilla and Mariana. Again, Enrique's words, ¿Dónde está ese judío que llaman rey?³ spoken when he enters Du Guesclin's tent, point to Mariana, where they are quoted from Froissart.⁴ Ayala does not mention them. Finally, in Zorrilla as in Mariana, Du Guesclin intervenes

¹Libro 17, Cap. 13.

²Ed.cit., p. 96.

³Act IV.

⁴Several contemporary writers credit Enrique with such reflections on his brother's origin. Cuvelier, fourteenth century chronicler of the exploits of Du Guesclin and the source of Jean d'Estouteville, reports him as saying to the king of Aragon:

"Vous savez que d'ám Pietre, que je n'ai mie chier,
Ne doit en toute Espagne tenir .l. seul denier;
Car il ne fu nez d'une loial moulier;
Mais en une Juifve qui se fist baptisier:
Là l'engendra mon père; Mais on le fist changier
Un filz contre une fille, pour le roy apaisier."

(Ed. E. Charrière, (Paris, 1839), I, 257). Cuvelier had previously related how a converted Jew had told Enrique this tale. The continuator of the Nangis chronicle tells a similar story of Enrique spreading a rumor to the effect that Don Pedro was not the son of Alfonso but was a child of Jewish race, who had been substituted for the daughter born to Alfonso's queen. The king is supposed to have threatened to kill his wife if she did not give birth to a son. Cf. the discussion on this point by Catalir García. Historia general de España, (Madrid, 1891), III, 3.

to help Enrique in his scuffle with his brother, an unsportsman-like act of which there is no hint in Ayala. As to the words no quito ni pongo rey pero ayudo a mi señor, which Zorrilla has Du Guesclin utter as he commits this bit of foul play, they were already a commonplace at the time when Zorrilla was writing. In addition to the material he drew from historical and traditional sources, Zorrilla, to be sure, added many fantastic and hair-raising details of his own.

IV

DON PEDRO AS EL JUSTICIERO

It is not unlikely that Mariana contributed his share to the dissemination of the Justiciero view of Don Pedro, while at the same time constantly qualifying him and his actions with the adjective cruel. He says at the end of his brief character sketch of Don Pedro, en las cosas de justicia era entero.¹ Such a statement coming from one who by no means was an apologist of Don Pedro, would carry its weight with a seventeenth century reader. The same idea had according to Zurita already been expressed in the Compendio, as he calls the Cuarta Crónica General. Says Zurita:

"En el Compendio se hace mención entre otras virtudes de este Príncipe, muchos tiempos después de su desastrada muerte, quando el odio y la afición de su Reyno habia ya, no solo cesado, pero estaba olvidado, que amaba mucho la justicia, é todos sus Reynos eran seguros de asonadas, é furtos, é robos
...2

This characterization, strange to say, is absent both from the version used by Llaguno y Amírola to annotate the Sumario del Dispensero³ and from that published in the Documentos inéditos

¹Libro 16, Cap. 16.

²Note to Ayala's "Crónica," B.A.E., LXVI, 592.

³Colección de las crónicas y memorias de los Reyes de Castilla, (Madrid, 1781), III.

para la historia de España.¹ However, having it on so excellent an authority as Zurita, we must conclude that it did actually exist in some manuscript.

Justicias represented in Don Pedro drama

Given this historical or pseudo-historical foundation, it was not a great step to the dramatist's presentation of Don Pedro as a Solomon, a Haroun al Raschid or a Sancho Panza in his island, dispensing impartial justice to all comers, the protector of the weak and lowly against the rich and powerful. And it is this which constitutes perhaps the most picturesque phase of the Don Pedro legend. Menéndez y Pelayo expresses the opinion that the theater did not originate this conception of him although it might have helped to diffuse it.² He called attention to the fact that Ortiz de Zúñiga relied on oral tradition for his account of the Zapatero y el Prebendado legend. There has since been pointed out in the Floresta española of Melchor de Santa Cruz a version of this story which antedates that of the seventeenth century drama, having been first published in 1574. We see from it that Lope altered the legend in the Audiencias, where the offense against the cobbler is the seduction of his wife and not the murder of his father as in Melchor de Santa Cruz, and the prebendado is a clérigo, not an arcediano, as in the earlier version. Moreover, in Lope's account the cobbler kills the prebendado on his own initiative, while in Santa Cruz he does so on the advice of Don Pedro himself. Lope has also omitted the detail of the Corpus Cristi procession during which the cobbler is

¹(Madrid, 1893), vol. CVI.

²Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega, (Madrid, 1923 ed.), IV, 346.

supposed to have wreaked his vengeance on the arcediano. On the other hand, Lope agrees with the earlier version both in the sentence pronounced by the archbishop against the prebendado, prohibiting him from saying mass for a year and that of Don Pedro against the cobbler, forbidding him to exercise his trade for the same period of time.

In a still later version, that of Bernardino Fernández de Velasco y Pimentel¹ we have the prebendado as a canónigo, who killed the cobbler's father with his own last in a fit of rage because the shoes he had ordered from him were not to his liking.² Velasco added a wife and four daughters to the cobbler's family and had the son sentenced to be drawn and quartered after wreaking his vengeance. This judgment is pronounced as unjust by Don Pedro, who, after ascertaining what the canónigo's punishment had been, sentences the shoemaker to a similar penalty. It appears then that Zorrilla did not alter the legend in representing the cobbler as avenging the murder of his father rather than the dishonor of his wife.

The mercader Judgment

The Zapatero y el Prebendado judgment seems to be an essentially Spanish conseja. However, in a number of the Don Pedro juicios, we have a reappearance of old tales. Such is the mercader decision in the Audiencias. A merchant, having lost a purse containing fifty doblas, promised a reward of ten doblas for its return but regretted his generosity when the purse was again safe in his possession. He therefore, instead of rewarding the honest

¹In the "Deleyte de la Discrecion y Facil Escuela de la Agudeza," (Madrid, 1743), ed. 1911 in Floresta General, no. 1983.

²This version is the source of Juan Arolas, El Zapatero de Sevilla.

old man who had found the purse, accused him of stealing ten doblas from it, saying that it had contained not fifty but sixty doblas. When the case was laid before Don Pedro, he, with characteristic impetuosity, turned the purse over to the old man, saying that evidently it was not the one the merchant had lost.

We find this story in Petrus Alfonsus,¹ where it is a sack containing one thousand livres and a golden serpent that is lost and a reward of one hundred livres that is offered, the owner later claiming that there had been two golden serpents. Here we have the detail of the finder returning the sack against the advice of his wife, and here it is a philosopher who intervenes, advising the king to give the reward to the finder and keep the rest until the rightful owner shall appear. The rich man then confesses his dishonesty, and his property is returned to him.

The Libro de los Enxemplos² takes up this version of the story. We also find it in the eighteenth century in Bernardino de Velasco,³ where it is the Grand Duke Alexander de Medicis who decides the case, indicating that Velasco's immediate source was probably Italian. The story did, in fact, exist in Italy in the sixteenth century in Giraldis Cintio.⁴ This author lays the scene in Ferrara and makes the marchese the judge. Here a poor woman with a marriageable daughter finds the purse. The marchese decides that since the money-bag found does not contain the amount of money the merchant claims, it must be one he himself had lost, and he therefore considers himself quite justified in giving it to the woman as a dowry for her daughter. This is evidently one of those stories that are attached to one famous personage after

¹Disciplina Clericalis, ed. Fr. Schmidt. (Berlin, 1827), p. 60.

² Clemente Sánchez de Vercial. "Libro de los enxemplos," ed. Goyanes, B.A.E., (Madrid, 1857), LI, no. CCCXI.

³Op. cit., no. 2117.

⁴Gli Scrittati, (Venice, 1608 ed.). "Deca Prima," Novella IX.

another. There must be a great many other versions of it in existence.

A Test for Scriveners

Juan Pascual's test for escribanos too is not original with Hoz y Mota. Whether there is any version earlier than that of Melchor de Santa Cruz, I do not know. He tells it as follows:

"Examinando en Sevilla a un escriuano, mandaron al que examinauan, que dicesse por testimonio quantas naranjas estauan en una aluerca, lasquales eran medias, y desde fuera parecian enteras: Dixo, que las saxassen fuera, para que las tomasse en la mano, que de otra manera no la hazia."¹

In the play, Juan Pascual asks a number of escribanos how many oranges there are in the pool before them. One after the other answers that there are three, until it comes to Sancho's turn. He rolls up his sleeves, puts his hand in the water and fishes out three orange halves. Don Pedro then makes him escribano mayor. Unlike the Zapatero y el Rey story, this tale is not applied to Don Pedro by Santa Cruz.²

V

SPANISH DON PEDRO PLAYS NOT IDENTIFIED OR NOT MENTIONED BY LOMBA

Ya anda la de Mazagatos

This play, presented at the Coliseo de la Cruz, according to a notice in the Memorial literario³ has since been shown by

¹(Brussels, 1614 ed.), p. 190.

²Fernández y González in La piel de la justicia, weaves another old conseja into the Don Pedro legend, one that is found in the Gesta Romanorum, (Tale XXIX of Wynnard Hooper ed., Swan translation, London, 1904), the Libro de los exemplos (CLIII), where it is credited to Valerius, and Sebastian Crizzo, Le Sei Giornate, (I, "Avenimento" XIX). It has to do with upholstering the judgment seats with the skins of corrupt judges, as an example for future maladministrators of the law.

³No.24 (Dec., 1785); cf. Lomba, op.cit., p. 265.

S. Griswold Morley¹ to be identical with the Historia de Mazagatos or Historia de Maragatos. The play was published by him² and again by the Academy.³ Frederico Ruiz Morcuende, who is responsible for the Academy edition, disagreeing with Mr. Morley, cites Fajardo, Medel, García de la Huerta, Arteaga and Moncín to support his attribution of the play to Lope. In this, as in so many of Lope's Don Pedro plays, we have the king enamoured of a lady of lower rank than his own and in the dénouement yielding her up to one of her station. In the present instance, Don Pedro's rival had done a little philandering on his own account with a village girl. Everything is smoothed out in the end, the king intervening in his capacity of Don Pedro el justiciero. The play, which lacks historical details, is one of the proverb dramas which are so common. Mr. Morley explains the title with the aid of Correas.

Doña Blanca de Borbón

The play with this title mentioned by Moratín as anonymous in his Catálogo de las piezas dramáticas publicadas en España desde el principio del siglo XVIII hasta la época presente⁴ is probably the Doña Blanca of José María Íñiguez, published in 1806. At any rate, Moratín states that he tried to make his list as nearly chronological as possible, and he puts this play shortly before those of Dionisio Solís, who belongs approximately to this period. Also, he included only plays either presented or published. In 1813, there was given at the Teatro de la Cruz a play with the title Blanca de Borbón, which Cotarelo y Mori⁵ believes

¹Buletin Hispanique (1923), XXV, 212 ff.

²Ibid., (1924), XXVI, 97 ff.

³Obras de Lope de Vega, (Madrid, 1930), X.

⁴1825; cf. Lomba, op.cit., p. 268.

⁵Isidoro Maiquez y el teatro de su tiempo, (Madrid, 1902), p. 349.

to be that of Íñiguez. It is reasonable to suppose that this is the play to which Moratín had reference, for the one by the Duque de Rivas was given at Seville, not at Madrid, and it is unlikely that Moratín knew of it.

The Duque de Rivas' Doña Blanca de Castilla

Little is known of this play, written in 1815, produced in Seville in 1817 and stolen with the author's baggage in 1823 as he was escaping by boat from Seville to Cádiz. The title is misleading, for the name Blanca de Castilla is usually given to the Spanish mother of Saint Louis, Don Pedro's wife being known as Blanca de Borbón.¹ We know from the letter of Ranz Romanillos, dated March 15, 1819² that a pastor appeared in it. This was probably the shepherd who, according to Ayala, warned Don Pedro, while he was hunting in the region of Xerez and Medina, that his treatment of Blanca le avia de ser muy acalonado.³ We also know from the fact that Ranz Romanillos speaks of Blanca as an innocent lamb that had fallen into the clutches of a wolf, that Don Pedro was shown in an unfavorable light. He says too that because of the passivity of Doña Blanca, the play was not as interesting as it might otherwise have been. He mentions a credulous archbishop, and we wonder whether this was the well-known Don Gil de Albornoz, archbishop of Toledo at Don Pedro's accession. He is supposed to have admonished him in regard to Doña Blanca, thereby making himself so obnoxious to the king, that it became necessary for him to retire to the Papal court, where he later won great fame.

¹We shall have occasion later to mention another play with similar title.

²Published by Manuel Cañete in Escritores españoles e hispano-americanos, (Madrid, 1884), pp. 127 ff.

³Año 12, Cap. 3.

Romanillos considers the characters of Blanca and the archbishop well-drawn and very natural. The alcaide, Zúñiga, who appears in the second act, is evidently the Íñigo Ortiz de Estúñiga who refused to have a hand in Blanca's death,¹ for Romanillos says of him:

"La historia ya da de él una idea muy ventajosa; pero sobre aquel fondo Vm. ha hecho primores, y ha dibujado un completo caballero castellano, modelo y dechado de fidelidad y pundonor."

An effort seems to have been made by the villain, Hernando, to induce Blanca to enter into a conspiracy against the king and thus bring about her ruin. As a counterplot, there was an attempt on the part of the archbishop to involve the self-same Hernando in machinations against the king and María de Padilla. These intrigues seem to Romanillos rather illogical. We learn from the same letter that Rivas was not completely satisfied with his play. He criticized the great number of soliloquies in the fifth act and the presentation of a page for the sole purpose of announcing the queen's death.

La Crueldad en el Throno

In the Biblioteca Capítular (Colombina) in Seville, there exists a play of this title in manuscript form, undated and signed only with the initials D.P.M.N.D.E.² The author, I have not been able to identify, but the play obviously belongs to the eighteenth century. It was probably inspired by the Puerta Macarena of Juan Pérez de Montalván, perhaps representing an attempt to fuse the

¹Ayala, loc.cit.

²I am indebted to my sister, Dorothy Schons, for this play. She happened upon it while going through some manuscripts in the Biblioteca Colombina. Knowing that I was working on the subject of Don Pedro el Cruel, she took down the title and the cast of characters on the chance that it might prove to be a play as yet unmentioned. It is numbered 63-3-5.

two parts of that play into one. The principal action centers in the death of Don Pedro's brother, the Maestre de Santiago, Don Fadrique, in the Alcázar of Seville. Montalván was the first dramatist to treat this incident unless, indeed — which is not unlikely — Lope de Vega's lost play, La muerte del Maestre¹ may have dealt with the subject.

The liaison between Don Fadrique and Doña Blanca

While its literary merit is slight, La Crueldad en el Throno is curious in that it treats as a fact the supposed liaison between Doña Blanca, Don Pedro's neglected wife, and the Maestre de Santiago. The Spanish dramatists of the seventeenth century carefully avoided this tradition. Lomba y Pedraja states:

"Difundióse por el pueblo la fama de este escandaloso suceso en un viejo romance, del cual cita Milá tres versiones, y solamente una Durán.² El teatro, sin embargo, no se dió por entendido de aquél, hasta que penetró en España la tragedia pseudoclásica al estilo francés. Esta, para hacer más aborrecibles a los Padillas, les achacaba la invención de tan odioso y falso delito, determinante de la sentencia de muerte que el Rey pronuncia contra Blanca sola (tragedia de Iñiguez) o contra Blanca y Fadrique (tragedias de Solís y de Gil y Zárate)."³

La Crueldad en el Throno presents Don Fadrique as actually enamoured of Doña Blanca.

The content of the play is briefly this: Blanca is about to arrive from France, and La Dama del Rey, who is presumably María de Padilla, although she is not mentioned by name, is very unhappy at the thought of losing her place in Don Pedro's affections. Her ana, Sancha, and her uncle, El Capitán de la Guardia, intended to represent Juan Fernández de Hinestrosa, of course, try

¹Included by Lope in the original list of his plays in the Peregrino en su patria, 1603.

²No. 965. With the version published by Lucas de Torre y Franco-Romero in the Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, (1909), XX, 248, there are now four known variants of this ballad.

³op.cit., p. 300.

to persuade her that the king still loves her and will be glad to marry her secretly in order to avoid the distasteful union with Blanca. They suggest this course of action to Don Pedro, who, after some hesitation, consents to it, partly out of resentment at his mother for presuming to arrange his life — for the marriage with Blanca was her idea — and partly because he has heard of a gran villanía, committed by Blanca and the Maestre. Blanca does not appear in the play. At an interview with his two bastard brothers, Fadrique and Enrique, Don Pedro offers to give up Blanca and permit Fadrique to marry her. He, being young and guileless, falls into the trap and admits his eagerness to make the king's fiancée his wife. He has hardly left the room when cries and a clatter of swords are heard, and we learn in the next scene that the Maestre has been killed.

La Dama del Rey and her companion, horrified at the fratricide, decide to retire to a convent and Enrique, who has escaped from the mêlée, outlines his plans for seizing the throne, it now being clear that it is God's will that he supplant Don Pedro and thus avenge Fadrique.

I shall not reiterate the arguments pro and con regarding the guilt or innocence of Fadrique and Blanca. Most serious historians have treated the matter as mere unfounded rumour. The most recent writer to defend the reputation of the queen is Georges Ciroc,¹ who takes up point by point the new arguments to prove her guilt set forth by Lucas de Torre y Franco Romero.²

The story, at all events, has undoubted dramatic possibilities, and one is rather surprised that it was not utilized by

¹"Le témoignage de López de Ayala au sujet de Don Fadrique, frère de Pierre-le-Cruel," Hispania, (Paris, 1922), pp. 70 ff.

²"Las bodas del Rey D. Pedro de Castilla," Revista de Archivos, (1909) XX, 28 ff.

the seventeenth century playwrights. In the Crueldad, the situation is merely alluded to, Blanca herself not appearing in the play, as has already been stated. The references to the matter are several in number. In addition to the one mentioned, we have the answer the Maestre receives to his inquiries regarding Blanca just before his interview with the king:

"Da. Blanca? esso anda malo
Ai le ha dado un no se que
no se si se ha amedrentado,
ello es mal de corazon
o uterino: alli andan varios
Fisicos, y metafisicos,
Doctores, cirujanos,
la comadre, un comadron
y tambien el Boticario..." (Act II, Sc. 3)

which is more scurrilous than the ballad referring to the birth of an illegitimate child¹ and seems to hint at a similar situation. Again, Enrique reproves his brother's ill-considered enthusiasm for the French princess:

"Aunque estes enamorado,
Jamás lo des a entender." (Ibid.)

And Don Pedro, as he plans his brother's death, gloats in advance over the prospect of a bloody revenge:

"quien tal hizo que tal aia
con esso verá Fadrique
si es bien que baile con Blanca."
(Act II, Sc. 2)

Date

Several circumstances indicate that the play belongs approximately in the first half of the eighteenth century. In addition to details of orthography, punctuation and vocabulary, it presents other ear-marks of the period. For while the play is divided into scenas, the unities are observed in it, the tragic catastrophe takes place behind the scenes, no gracioso appears

¹Cf. p. 29.

and there is a decidedly moralizing tone, at the same time, the piece is in three acts, we have a mixture of traditional verse forms rather than the hendecasyllable which characterizes the Neo-Classic tragedies of the close of the century, and there is still present a comic element, although this is not centered in one person. There also still remain anacronisms in costume.¹

The play seems to be one of those refundiciones in which the content was so completely changed that one had difficulty in recognizing the result as a re-working of the play from which it sprang. The Crueldad shows the Horatian insistence upon the duty of the drama to teach a moral lesson, which is characteristic of Luzán's Poetics and eighteenth century dramatic theory. La Dama del Rey and her ama, Sancha, horrified by the cruelty of Don Pedro, which finds its climax in the Maestre's death, renounce the world and take refuge in a convent. The satire directed at Blanca's coquetry and the vanity of the queen mother supplies some of the comic element and is also helpful in dating the play. Even the omission of the French captains in Enrique's plans to wrest his brother's throne from him may be an expression of the eighteenth century hatred of the French, which is mentioned by Feijoo² and which was a hang-over from the French wars of the late seventeenth century. In the Historia del Teatro Español of Narciso Díaz de Escovar and Francisco de F. Lasso de la Vega, we read of the condition of the theater at the beginning of the eighteenth century:

"...todo era aceptado, aplaudido, alentado por el público, que sólo exigía, fiel a sus sentimientos y tradiciones, que los argumentos y los personajes fueran españoles."³

¹Such as the hoop skirt of the queen mother.

²Teatro crítico universal, II, 193 ff.

³I, 281.

So, in place of Du Guesclin, Enrique sends for the Condestable Ruy López. The author was probably thinking of the Condestable Ruy López Dávalos of the reign of Juan II. The fact that Enrique's other military leader, Rodrigo Villandrando, is a famous captain of that period, would lead one to think so. It is quite likely that he chose this second person to take the place of the Bègue de Villaines, who historically plays an important part in Enrique's conquest of his brother's kingdom. For in Act III, Enrique offers to Villandrando the condado of Ribadeo, which, according to several chronicles, was the Bègue's reward for the help he rendered to Enrique.¹ In the Crueldad, Enrique says to Villandrando:

"Vuestro honor, i vuestro aliento
Sera mi apoio i mi entivo
De Ribadeo el Condado
Desde luego os adjudico." (Act III)

Sources

La Puerta Macarena

That the author was recasting the Puerta Macarena, is clear from the title of the play itself, which reminds one of the closing words of Montalván's second part:

"tengan el fin que pretendo
con la introduccion de Enrique
las crueldades de don Pedro."

The mention of the gate (at which Blanca is supposed to have arrived in Act I) also makes this appear probable.²

¹Ayala, Año 18, Cap. 3; Cuvelier:

"Le Besgue de Vilaines c'est à eulx présenté
qui depuis en Espaigne ot tellement regné
qu'il fu de Ribedieu depuis conte nomme."

(Op.cit., I, 269)

²The Crueldad does not quote, as does Montalván, from the ballad, Yo me estaba allá en Coimbra, in which the Macarena gate is mentioned.

This eighteenth century play has many additional details in common with the Puerta Macarena. In both, Don Pedro promises to marry María de Padilla; in both, the queen mother has been instrumental in bringing about a marriage between her son and the French princess; in both, María is an essentially kind person.¹

The differences between them are more numerous. To mention only a few of them: 1. The Puerta Macarena puts some scenes in France; in the Crueldad, all the action takes place in the Alcázar of Seville;² 2. in P.M., Fadrique is in love with Doña Diana, not Blanca, and therefore his death is differently motivated; 3. in P.M., Don Pedro takes Don Fadrique prisoner and has him led to execution, in C., he has the Capitán fall upon him and kill him; 4. in C., Enrique is with Fadrique when he is killed, in P.M., he is not; 5. in P.M., María de Padilla intercedes for Blanca, in C., she does not; 6. in P.M., Blanca appears, in C., all the action in which she plays a part takes place off stage; 7. in C., the king's mistress enters a convent, in P.M., she does not. There are a great many minor differences, but these will suffice to show that the author of the eighteenth century refundición has really transformed the whole play — and not for the better, be it said.

Ayala and Mariana

There are some details which point to Ayala as their ultimate source, and yet they are so changed that it is probable the author only knew of them through hearsay. Such, for instance, is the circumstance that Galalón, a soldier and servant of Fadrique, fleeing from the assassins who have killed his master, takes refuge with the Dama del Rey.³ The author of the Crueldad omits

¹Mariana depicts her thus as well as Ayala.

²Doubtless, to secure Classic unity of place.

³Ayala, Año 9, Cap. 3.

the squire's snatching up the young daughter of Don Pedro¹ and has him escape and later serve Enrique. The offer to Villandrando of Ribadeo also points to Ayala, where, however, the donation is made to the Bègue de Vilaine, as has already been stated.

However, in telling of Don Pedro's instant feeling of repulsion toward Blanca, the Crueldad uses Mariana's very expression, dar en rostro. As for the words, hacer armas, used several times,² they may not necessarily indicate that Froissart was a source but may be a mere Gallicism.³

General Characteristics

All the characters are mere pale shadows without individuality. Don Pedro has lost the colossal proportions of his seventeenth century prototype, painted by Lope. He is presented as cruel, the title itself insisting on this estimate of him. There is much stress laid on the part played by the divine will in Pedro's defeat and Enrique's victory. The bastard, in fact, with considerable smugness, qualifies himself as justo... cristiano... belicoso, sabio, pio.⁴ He speaks of aquel gran hombre de Dios, que el Reino me predixo,⁵ referring doubtless to the clérigo de Santo Domingo, who prophesied to Don Pedro his end at Enrique's

¹Fernández y González in Doña María Coronel gives this detail.

²Act II.

³Prosper Mérimée, Histoire de D. Pèdre, roi de Castille, (Paris, 1865 ed.), p. 317 uses this expression in French, attributing it to the French chronicler. "Faire armes," he says, "pour parler comme Froissart." As a matter of fact, Froissart does not use the words in the way Mérimée indicates. He has "là eut fait tamainte appertisse d'armes," (ed. of Collection des chroniques et Trouvères Belges, (Brussels, 1869), VII, 75), "y fist merveilles d'armes," (p. 178) etc. The phrase, faire des armes exists in modern French. Its Hispanicized form would be hacer armas.

⁴Act III.

⁵Ibid.

hands if he did not mend his ways.¹ The remark he makes concerning his brother: ya creo que trata en ensalmos seems to point to this incident, for according to the historical accounts, Don Pedro believed that Enrique had sent the clérigo to him. Ayala, Mariana and the Cuarta Crónica General all dwell on the divine intervention.² The French accounts too emphasize God's disapproval of Don Pedro, expressed by the Pope's recognition of Enrique as king.³ In the Crueldad, Enrique prays for divine guidance:

"En ti, mi Dios, mi esperanza,
y mi corazon radico.
Inspiradme lo mejor:
a mi espiritu dad brio:
rectificad mi razon
Señoread mi albedrio." (Act III, Sc. 5)

A pious Enrique, indeed!

The bastard mentions Men Rodríguez de Senabria as being on his side.⁴ Ayala⁵ and Mariana⁶ present this individual as with Don Pedro at Montiel and treating with Du Guesclin to aid the king's escape, he himself later accompanying him to the tent of the Breton leader. Ayala speaks of a rumor to the effect that Men Rodríguez was suspected of having betrayed his royal master on this occasion but himself offers proof that the suspicion was

¹Ayala, Año 11, Cap. 9; Mariana, Libro 17, Cap. 4.

²In the Abreviada (Note to Ayala, Año 18, Cap. 11), which quotes Enrique's letter to the Black Prince, the bastard founded his right to the throne on the ancient Gothic right of the people to elect their own rulers, saying that this custom was still observed at that time in the practice of having the Cortes swear the heir.

³Froissart: "Si persévéra tout dis cils rois dans Piètres en son péchié. Adont fu regardé et avisé comment, ne par quel voie on le poroit batre, ne corrugier, et fu dit qu'il n'estoit mies dignes de porter nom de roy et de tenir royaume... Là fu de nostre Saint-Père le pape légitimés Henris à obtenir royaume, et maudis et condempnés de bouche de pape li rois dans Piètres." (op.cit., p. 87). Cuvelier justifies Enrique's becoming king both by the will of God and Pedro's supposed illegitimacy. (cf. p. 9).

⁴Act III.

⁵Año 20, Cap. 8.

⁶Libro 17, Cap. 13.

unjustified. For a brief period at the beginning of Don Pedro's reign, Men Rodríguez seems in fact to have been in Enrique's service, for he went with him to Asturias after his marriage to Doña Juana, daughter of Don Juan Manuel, against the king's will.¹ However, he returned to Don Pedro later, being on his side on the occasion of his parley with Enrique at Tejadillo in 1354² and at the time of Enrique's first seizure of the throne was taken prisoner at Briviesca, while fighting for Don Pedro.³ Froissart, whose account in turn is founded on that of Chancos' Herald does not speak of Men Rodríguez at all, mentioning only Fernán de Castro by name as with Pedro at Montiel.⁴

María de Padilla, here a decidedly weak person, controlled by her uncle and her ama, shows the kindness of heart credited to her by history rather than the cruelty with which popular tradition charges her. She is overcome with grief and horror at the Maestre's death⁵ and aids his squire to escape. There is some historical evidence of María's founding a convent if not of her actually entering one. Just before Don Pedro's marriage to Doña Juana de Castro, a time when the relations between him and María must have been more or less strained, Pedro wrote to Innocent VI, asking permission to found the convent of Santa Clara to receive her.⁶ The Pope readily gave his consent, congratulating María on her pious intention. His letter to her is still extant.⁷ However, as Daumet points out,⁸ María was merely given permission to enter

¹Ayala, Año 1, Cap. 12.

²Ibid., Año 5, Cap. 23.

³Ibid., Año 17, Cap. 3.

⁴Op.cit., p. 270.

⁵Cf. Lomba, op.cit., p. 293.

⁶Raynaldo, Anal. 1354, n. 20, cited in note to Ayala, Año 5, Cap. 10.

⁷Wadding, Annales minores, (Rome, 1731-1886), VIII, 451.

⁸Georges Daumet, Innocent VI et Blanche de Bourbon, (Paris, 1899), p. 23.

a convent of the order once a year, not to become a permanent resident. The truth of the matter probably was that the idea of her taking the veil was not hers but Don Pedro's, and that as soon as his brief infatuation for Doña Juana was over, he changed his mind about it. A little later, the queen mother, Enrique and other relatives demanded of Don Pedro:

"...que fuese su merced de tomar a la Reyna Da. Blanca su muger, é traerla consigo...é que pusiese en Orden en el Reyno de Aragon a Da. Maria de Padilla..."¹

a demand with which he refused to comply.

As regards her marriage to Don Pedro, Ortiz de Zúñiga² gives two versions, Ayala's, which describes the marriage as secret, and that of antiguas memorias and Pablo de Espinosa, which presents it as having been celebrated publicly. Ayala relates that Don Pedro told the Cortes in 1362, after María and Blanca were both dead, that Doña Blanca had not been his legitimate wife:

"...que él oviera su casamiento con Da. Maria de Padilla antes que casase con la Reyna Da. Blanca por palabras de presente, é que desto ficiera testigos a D.Diego García de Padilla, Maestre de Calatrava, hermano de la dicha Da.Maria... é a Juan Ferrandez de Henestrosa, tio...é a Juan Alfonso de Mayorga...é a Juan Pérez de Orduña, abad de Santander, é su Capellan mayor."³

The Crueldad follows this version, omitting, however, Juan Alfonso de Mayorga from the list of witnesses. The Dama by her tears and her uncle by his arguments have finally persuaded the king, who says:

"Se hara el desposorio
en la forma clandestina,
oi, sin falta, luego, al punto
con vos, D.Diego García
de Padilla y Juan de Orduña
Capellan de mi familia

¹Ayala, Año 5, Cap. 23.

²Anales de Sevilla, (1795 ed.), II, 161.

³Año 13, Cap. 7.

que entiende de theologia
los tres testigos sereis..."¹

Villaespesa's Doña María de Padilla

Sources and General Characteristics

Francisco Villaespesa's play, written after the publication of Lomba's article,² was probably inspired by Las mujeres del Rey Don Pedro of Juan B. Sitges³ — since it is dedicated to the author of that study. Villaespesa, nevertheless, presents situations which Sitges declares unhistorical. Like the Crueldad, but with much greater delicacy, Villaespesa depicts Don Fadrique and Doña Blanca as in love with each other. Don Pedro's brother, just after the death of his mother, the unfortunate Doña Leonor de Guzmán, is sent as an ambassador to Narbonne to arrange Don Pedro's marriage to the French princess and himself falls in love with her at first sight. Sitges says on this point:

"Es aventurado admitir que Don Fadrique, Maestre de Santiago, estuviera entre los caballeros españoles que fueron a Narbona en busca de Doña Blanca."⁴

Villaespesa has chosen the period when Alburquerque felt his influence over Don Pedro slipping from him. He had been the ayo of the crown prince in the days of Alfonso XI, had led his detachment and borne his standard in the campaigns of that monarch.⁵ María de Padilla and her relatives are slowly but surely

¹Act I. Mariana and Ortiz de Zúñiga follow Ayala in the names of the witnesses. The Cuarta Crónica garbles them more or less. Here they are given as Don Alonso, obispo de Leon, e don Sancho, obispo de Astorga (Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España, CVI, 92). Fernandez y González, Doña María Coronel, has the four as they are found in Ayala.

²In 1915.

³1910.

⁴Op.cit., p. 353, quoted by Georges Cirot, op.cit., p. 71, note.

⁵"Crónica de Alfonso XI," B.A.E., LXVI, Chapters 243, 272, etc.

undermining Albuquerque's power. Villaspesa gives his imagination free play in inventing the intrigue of the drama. He represents Albuquerque as making a final play for his vanishing power by carrying María off to Medina, where Doña Blanca, the queen mother and others of Albuquerque's allies are gathered, with the intention of compelling her to take the vows. As stated above,¹ there was historically an attempt made to force María to enter a convent. The abduction is pure invention, although there is evidence that Don Pedro may have feared something of the sort. For Ayala relates how on one occasion he left María in the castle of Montalván:

"que es un castillo muy fuerte; é dexó con ella á un su hermano bastardo que decian Juan Garcia, que fué despues Maestre de Santiago, é otros de quien el Rey fiaba, porque estoviese segura; ca se rescalaba de Don Juan Alfonso (de Albuquerque), que le pesaba porque la él tanto amaba."²

Through the treachery of one of the conspirators, Don Pedro is admitted to the castle of Medina just in time to prevent María's taking the veil. He condemns Albuquerque to death.³

Villaspesa is in accord with Sitges,⁴ whose authority in turn is Ayala, in representing Albuquerque as at least partly responsible for Don Pedro's marriage to Blanca. For to Albuquerque it was a means of combating the growing influence of the Pa-

¹p. 34.

²Año 4, Cap. 5.

³Pedro is accused by Ayala of having put his former valide out of the way but not in so public a manner: "E á pocos dias luego morió y Don Juan Alfonso de Albuquerque, é segund se sopo despues, fué su muerte en esta guisa. Don Juan Alfonso adolesció en Medina del Campo, é era y con el Infante Don Ferrando de Aragon un físico Romano, que decian Maestre Pablo, é curaba del dicho Don Juan Alfonso: é el Rey Don Pedro sopolo, é envió tratar con el dicho Maestre Pablo que diese hierbas á Don Juan Alfonso, é que él le heredaria, é le faga muchas mercedes: é el físico fizolo así, é dió hierbas á Don Juan Alfonso en un jaroque, de que morió" (Año 5, Cap. 27).

⁴Cf. Círcot, op.cit., p. 75, note.

dillas.¹ Fernán de Castro says:

"Ese amor la causa es
por la cual el casamiento
aconseja el portugués.
Ve morir su valimiento..." (Act I)

In the love affair between the queen mother and Alburquerque, Villaespesa perhaps shows the influence of modern historical research. Ángel de los Ríos was the first to suggest that the Pero Gil who, together with the Moors, sacked and burned Úbeda after the battle of Nájera and who is supposed to have besieged Baeza unsuccessfully, was really Don Pedro himself.² The name Pero Gil exists in certain letters of Enrique Trastámara and other documents, where it is used in such a way as to make it clear that Enrique's brother, Peter the Cruel, is the one referred to. The usurper is thought to have implied thereby that Pedro was the son of the valido, Juan Alfonso de Alburquerque. The siege of Baeza is celebrated in the earliest of the romances fronterizos, which begins:

"Cercada tiene a Baeza
esse Arraez Audalla Mir."³

Alburquerque had a son, Martín Gil, who is mentioned several times by Ayala. Another bit of evidence that indicates that Don Pedro was really known as Pero Gil is the circumstance that his followers are said to have been called emperejilados.⁴ While speaking

¹He had himself presented María to Don Pedro. Ayala says: "al comienzo él fué en el consejo que la tomaba el Rey, por quanto la dicha Doña María andaba doncella en casa de Doña Isabel, muger de Don Juan Alfonso, é cuidó el dicho Don Juan apoderarse mas del Rey por ella, pues era de su casa." (Año 4, Cap. 5).

²Cf. Amador de los Ríos, Historia de los judíos de España, (Madrid, 1876), II, 207, note.

³Cf. William J. Entwistle, "The 'Romancero del Rey Don Pedro' in Ayala and the 'Cuarta Crónica General'," Modern Language Review, (1930), XXV, 307 ff. and Menéndez Pidal, El Romancero, (Madrid, 1910).

⁴Cf. Catalina García, Historia General de España, (Madrid, 1891), III, 4, note. Could it be that here originated the proverbs: Huir del perejil y dar (o salir) en la frente and Ser como

of a past crime on the part of the queen mother and Alburquerque, Villaespesa does not mention the name Pero Gil and says nothing of Pedro being the son of Alburquerque. However, he may have intended to imply this situation.

López de Ayala himself plays a rôle in María de Padilla and a most unflattering one. He is presented as both a traitor and a coward. Ayala has been much criticized for deserting Don Pedro when fortune turned against him, and it is on this account that doubt has been cast on the veracity of his chronicle. In the play, he acts as Enrique's ambassador in trying to win Fadrique over to the cause of the conspirators. Caught by Don Pedro after he has aided in kidnapping María, he pusillanimously falls on his knees and begs for mercy. Castro says of him:

"Lo que tiene de poeta
Le falta a Ayala de honrado,
que si mide bien los versos,
Mide, en cambio, mal sus actos!" (Act I)

It was undoubtedly Sitges' work which gave Villaespesa the idea of presenting María de Padilla as the heroine of his play. He had, of course, the authority of Ayala in picturing her as a kindly person.¹ However, it is unlikely that any Spanish dramatist previous to the twentieth century would have ventured to offer her as the protagonist of a play. Like Pérez de Montal-

D. Perejil, que daba arremetidas entre los suyos? The nature of these adages makes it rather plausible. Sbarbi, Diccionario de Refranes defines the first one thus: "Indica el gran cuidado que se debe tener en la elección para que, huyendo de una cosa mala, no se elija otra peor" and the second: "Dícese de aquellos que, en vez de favorecer, tirar contra los de su linaje." There are also a number connected with Gil. Montoto, Personajes, personas y personillas gives the proverbial phrase: Yo estoy como perro con vejiga, que nunca falta un Gil que me persiga and quotes from Marcos de Obregón: "Pero tornando a lo primero, ¿por qué pensáis, le dije, que dicen ordinariamente nunca falta un Gil que me persiga? Que no dicen un don Francisco, un don Pedro, sino un Gil, porque nunca son perseguidores sino hombres bajos, como Gil Mazano, Gil Pérez..." (Desc. XVII). Who shall say that this is the right explanation?

¹Año 9, Cap. 3.

ván, Villaespesa exalts neither María nor Blanca the one above the other. Blanca is at first incensed at the favorite, but when she learns that it was not out of thirst for power but because of sincere love for Don Pedro that María had become his mistress, she forgives her, for she feels that her own conscience is not without guilt. Here it is María, not Blanca, who is represented as devout. After her abduction to Medina, she is found on her knees before an image of Christ. However, she shows that she belongs to the twentieth century rather than the fourteenth by her exclamation:

"¡y por su amor [Don Pedro's] dejaré
hasta el trono del Señor!" (Act III)

Villaespesa's intention in showing Blanca as untrue to Don Pedro is probably to insure the sympathy of the audience for María and the king. However, her guilt is known to neither, and because of that fact, we feel that Don Pedro's sending her to prison is unjustified and arbitrary. She was concerned in the conspiracy to kidnap María, to be sure, but one can hardly blame a neglected wife for trying to defeat the rival who has taken her place.

Don Pedro shows his traditional bravery and haughtiness.

Castro says of him:

"Mas no se rinde en verdad,
de don Pedro la altivez:
Lo que le falta de edad
le sobra de intrepidez!" (Act I)

Young as he is, he has already behind him three well-known justicias, the executions of Garcilaso de la Vega in Burgos, Coronel in Aguilar and Núñez de Prado, the Maestre de Calatrava. These are all historical cases.

There are other historical references. Alburquerque, after enumerating his own services to Don Pedro, exaggerating them somewhat, speaks of three possible claimants to the throne

of Castile, any one of whom he might support to avenge himself on Don Pedro.¹ The first two, Don Pedro of Portugal and Don Fernando of Aragon were in fact brought forward as candidates for the Castilian crown early in the reign of Peter the Cruel.² However, Enrique, the third person mentioned by Alburquerque, was not considered as a possible successor to Don Pedro until long after Alburquerque's death. So in other details, Villaespesa mingles fact with fancy.

On the legendary side, we have a brief reference to the María Coronel tradition, given in almost the words of Juan de Mena's Laberinto de Fortuna:

"la muy casta dueña de manos crueles,
digna corona de los Coroneles,
que quiso con fuego vencer sus fogueras."
(Copla 79)

Villaespesa paraphrases:

"Como la muy casta dama,
la de las manos crueles,
gloria de los Coroneles
y admiración de la fama,
la que con su propio fuego
quiso vencer sus hogueras."³ (Act II)

Juan de la Cerda, who historically was the husband of María Coronel, is one of the conspirators against Don Pedro in Villaespesa's play.

¹Act I.

²Ayala, Año I, Cap. 13 and Año 5, Cap. 8.

³Lomba y Pedraja discusses in detail the several versions of this legend. (Op.cit., p. 285). Fernández y González in his short story Doña María Coronel and in La piel de la justicia. Leyendas del tiempo del Rey Don Pedro also gives this particular form of the story but with many fantastic additions.

PART II

DON PEDRO IN FRENCH DRAMA

Lomba y Pedraja names two French plays on Don Pedro, De Belloy's and Voltaire's, both of the eighteenth century. However, already in the seventeenth century Don Pedro had been presented in the French theater. He also appeared again several times after Voltaire.

It is not surprising to see that in transport to foreign countries, Don Pedro lost much of his picturesqueness. We no longer see him stealing about the streets at night, his creaking knee joints betraying his identity in sword encounters with his nobles.¹ The Vieja del Candilejo has also disappeared, the Cabeza del Rey Don Pedro survives in only one instance and there is a mere vestige left of the justiciero aspect of the king. The lack of picturesqueness in the dramatic treatment of the subject abroad is undoubtedly due to the fact that the foreign Don Pedro drama was not an off-shoot of the Spanish, in most cases, but was derived from historical sources. Consequently, Don Pedro was usually pictured either as a monster of cruelty or as a weakling controlled by his courtiers.² Foreign authors therefore either

¹The earliest mention of this tradition, which came to be a commonplace in the Spanish Romantic period, is, as far as I know, no earlier than the seventeenth century. There we find it in El Diablo está en Cantillana of Luis Vélez de Guevara (Act III), and in El montañés Juan Pascual of Hoz y Mota (Act II). Gracian does not confine the creaking to his knees: "Acullá hace ruido el más cruel de los Pedros, que no sólo los dientes, pero todos los huesos está crujiendo de rabia." (Criticón, Crisi VII). In France, Dumas perpetuated the tradition in the novel and the short story.

²The early French historical accounts uniformly depict him as cruel. Cuvelier, probably to show in strong relief his hero, Du Guesclin, makes him a coward as well. Froissart, however, gives him credit for courage. Just before Montiel, when everything was going against him, "Nonpourquant, comme bons chevaliers et hardis qu'il estoit, et de grant confort et emprise" (op.cit., p. 268), he makes a brave stand. And again: "...là estoit il rois dans

heaped vituperation upon his head or made him the object of a rather maudlin sympathy.

At first glance, it is somewhat astonishing, in view of the French origin of Don Pedro's ill-starred queen, that she should have attracted French dramatists so little. The explanation is perhaps to be found in the very passivity of Blanca's character historically, which did not make her an ideal dramatic heroine. For while the Classic French drama required an innocent victim of an adverse destiny, at the same time it demanded that the victim should struggle valiantly against that destiny. That the Spanish Neo-Classic drama so often chose Blanca as a heroine, is only another indication that the Spanish dramatists did not comprehend the real nature of the Classic French drama or of the ancient Greek tragedy.

I

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Charles Regnault's Blanche de Bourbon, 1642

The tragi-comedy, however, would not have the same reason for objecting to Blanca as a heroine, and it is indeed in a play of this type that she makes her appearance in the seventeenth century. In view of the dedication of Regnault's play, first published in 1642, to Mme. de Longueville, we are inclined to suspect that the author's motive in choosing this particular subject was the hope that thus he might recommend himself to the good graces of that lovely patron of letters. For Mme. de Longueville was a Bourbon, and in portraying the charm and the virtue of

Piètres hardis hom durement, qui se combatoit moult vaillamment."
(Loc.cit.)

Blanche, queen of Castile, the dramatist was at the same time extolling Anne de Bourbon, Duchesse de Longueville.¹ His own words show his adulatory intention:

"Cette Reyne fut autrefois la plus vertueuse de son siècle: mais quelques beautez que la Nature luy ait données & quelques vertus que le Ciel luy ait departies on reconnoist aujourduy, en vous admirant, qu'elle ne fut pas la plus parfaite de sa race."²

The Enchanted Girdle

In Blanche de Bourbon, Regnault represents the story of the magic girdle. According to a popular legend, María de Padilla is supposed to have induced a Jewish magician to enchant a girdle, Blanca's gift to the king, and that in consequence of this magic charm, the king's affections were transferred from Blanca to María. Lomba y Pedraja, after mentioning this and other popular traditions regarding María, says:

"El teatro no recogió ninguna de las tradiciones populares que se propalaron acerca de Doña María. Más bien se dejó influir por Ayala, y fué con ella benévolo. La tragedia al modo francés, que constantemente la presentó con los mas odiosos colores, intrigante, envidiosa y pérfida, tampoco debe nada a la tradición."³

It seems strange that a French dramatist should have treated a phase of the Don Pedro legend that, as far as is known, was entirely neglected by playwrights in Spain itself. However, if we keep in mind Regnault's desire to please Mme. de Longueville, the reason for his choosing this particular legend becomes quite clear. Most of the Spanish Neo-Classic and Romantic plays on Blanca had explained Don Pedro's antagonism toward her by a sus-

¹It is interesting to remember that this lady's very title is an additional bond uniting her with the events of Don Pedro's life. For Bertrand Du Guesclin was Count of Longueville. He later ceded the county to Charles VI. Charles VII in turn presented it to the "Bastard of Orleans", the ancestor of the Longueville family.

²(Paris, 1643 ed.)

³Op.cit., p. 293.

picion implanted in his mind by the Padillas regarding the relationship between her and Padrique. They represented it as an unjust suspicion, to be sure. But Regnault did not wish even a breath of scandal to sully the fair escutcheon of the Bourbons. Therefore, the enchanted girdle story seemed made for his purpose.

Moreover, he was writing in a period when Magic was very popular in the theater. Ernst Friedrich has shown to what extent it played a part in the French drama of the time, authors sometimes introducing it into serious plays just to satisfy this mania on the part of the public. Thus the magicien or sorcier was one of the typical figures of the French pastoral drama, and unhappy lovers, victims of a sorcerer, were common.¹

Rotrou's Innocente Infidélité presents a situation similar to the one in Blanche de Bourbon. Although the magic object in that play is a ring, and the king is a fictitious one, the general circumstances are the same. In both, we have a king as the effect of a magic charm deserting his wife for his mistress; the queen, a patient Griselda, sentenced to death; the king undergoing a revulsion of feeling as soon as the charm is removed, condemning the wicked mistress to imprisonment, attempting to take his own life and everything at last ending happily in the queen's restoration to her husband's affections. That Regnault had Rotrou's play in mind is not likely since he tells the story of Don Pedro, to whom it actually is attributed by contemporary documents. However, since Rotrou borrowed freely from the Spanish, as is well known, it is not at all unlikely that there may have existed a Spanish play in the seventeenth century which treated this legend, but which out of respect for the royal family attributed it to a

¹Ernst Friedrich, "Die Magie im französischen theater des XVI und XVII Jahrhunderts," (Leipzig, 1908), Münchener Beiträge zur Romanischen Philologie, XLI.

fictitious king and changed the charm to a ring.¹

Possible Sources

The Ballads

This tradition is told in two ballads,² neither one of which is a romance viejo. Since Corneille had seen some of the Spanish ballads,³ it is not impossible that Regnault may have known them. However, we can hardly imagine that the ultra sophisticates of the Hotel de Rambouillet interested themselves in this primitive type of poetry. In any case, since the play shows a knowledge of the history of Don Pedro's reign which could not have been obtained from the ballads, we must look to historical accounts for additional sources.⁴

Life of Innocent VI

The fact that Regnault presents Blanca as having at first been passionately loved by Pedro, suggests the contemporary life of Innocent VI, best known in the Baluze edition,⁵ but which had

¹Friedrich says that the magic in the plays he examined was usually due to foreign influence, especially Spanish.

²Durán, 967 and 980.

³In 1648, he speaks in the Avertissement to the Cid of having seen des originaux decousus de leurs anciennes histoires. (Cf. E. Martinenche, L'Espagne et le Romantisme, (Paris, 1922), p. 57). Bense du Puis and Chapelain also had some knowledge of the romanceros.

⁴We have no positive proof that Regnault knew Spanish. Gustave Lanson thinks Cervantes was exaggerating when he said: "En Francia ni varon ni juer deja de aprender la lengua castellana," but believes the Spanish language began to be studied in the seventeenth century, partly because of the coming of a Spanish queen, and that between 1620 and 1660 there was probably not an outstanding person in France who did not have at least a smattering of it. (Cf. Gustave Lanson, "Etudes sur les rapports de la littérature française et de la littérature espagnole au XVII^e siècle," Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, (Paris, 1896), III, 45 ff.)

⁵"Prima vita Innocentii VI", Vitae paparum Avenionensium, (Paris, 1693).

been previously published by Bosquet¹ and was readily accessible to Regnault. In the play, Henry says of the king in reply to a remark by the Count of Narbonne:

"Il est vray qu'il ayma sans l'auoir iamais veuë
La parfaicte beauté dont le ciel l'a pourveuë,
Il estoit consommé des flammes de ses yeux,
Je l'ay surpris cent fois, à genoux, sans parole,
Pres d'un portrait de Blanche, alors sa seule idole..."
(Act I, Sc. I)

The following is a free translation of the contemporary Latin account:

"And at this time, Peter, king of Castile, married Blanca, daughter of the Duke of Bourbon, previously mentioned. At first he dearly loved her and won her, for she was very beautiful and adorned with great virtues; but very soon, through the machinations of the devil, he hated and detested her; and this they say was brought about by a certain woman whom the king had loved previously and who, seeing that the king held her in contempt and completely abandoned her because of this woman, contrived the hatred mentioned above, perhaps with the aid of a Jew who also conspired against the queen; he is supposed to have done so because the queen, seeing that he and many others of his faith visited the king frequently and received many favors and honors in his court, was attempting to turn the king against them and have them expelled from the realm. In this attempt, the queen took less care than she should have done to dissimulate for the moment and act secretly and cautiously, so as to keep the matter entirely hidden from those concerned and prevent what happened. However, the beginning of the king's dislike and hatred was, as they say, that the queen had given the king a beautiful golden girdle which he liked immensely and often wore as an ornament. However, the woman in her jealousy of the queen together with the Jew gained possession of the girdle and procured through magic arts that one solemn feast day while the king was wearing the girdle in the presence of all his court, it seemed to him as well as all the rest that he was encircled by a large and terrible snake instead of the girdle. Those who saw this were naturally terrified and alarmed. When the king asked for an explanation, he was told by the bystanders — among whom there were perhaps some who were a party to the conspiracy — that this was the girdle given him by the queen his wife as a duty gift and a joke. On this account, he hated her so from that hour on, that he did not wish to see her again nor to speak with her..."

¹Pontificum romanorum, qui e Gallia oriundi in ea sederunt, historia, ab anno Christi 1305 ad annum 1394, (Paris, 1632).

Polydore Vergil and Mariana

Polydore Vergil¹ also tells the story but without mentioning Pedro's early love for Blanca. However, this account resembles Regnault's in that there is no mention of the girdle turning into a snake. Mariana gives the snake version very briefly.² Several earlier Spanish historians give varying details, but it is not likely that these accounts were available to Regnault.

Popular Origin of the Legend

The ultimate source of this legend is popular tradition, to which even the fourteenth century life of Innocent VI attributes it, twice remarking, ut dicitur. Even at the present day María de Padilla is regarded as a witch or a gipsy by Andalusian superstition.³ Menéndez y Pelayo⁴ calls attention to two conjuros diabólicos which appeared in El Folk-Lore Andaluz⁵ and which had been obtained from a gipsy of Carmona. In both of these occurs the name María Paílla, the gipsy explaining that María was the wife of the chief devil. Rodríguez Marín gathered several others from oral tradition but thinks they have to do with a later archi-bruja. However that may be, so closely is Carmona connected with Don Pedro's history, that it seems extremely probable that the conjuros obtained from there do indeed concern Don Pedro's charmer.⁶

¹Anglicae historiae libri viginti septem, (Basileae, 1555), p. 387.

²Libro 16, Cap. 18.

³Dumas doubtless had this tradition in mind when in Le Bâtard de Mauléon he had María disguise herself as a Bohemian. Mérimée (op.cit., p. 109) had already called attention to the fact that the gipsies did not appear in Europe until a century after María's time.

⁴Antología, XII, 123.

⁵1882.

⁶It was at Carmona that Don Pedro left his and María de Padilla's children shortly before his tragic death at Montiel. And it was Carmona which for so long afterwards resisted Enrique in defense of these children.

According to some accounts, Don Pedro was bewitched not

Since Mme. de Longueville, who in her youth frequented the Hotel de Rambouillet, was much given to intellectual pursuits, it is quite likely that she knew the legends concerning this fourteenth century member of her house. In view of the interest of the period in magic and the social prominence of Mme. de Longueville, they may even have been a subject of conversation in the ranks of the Précieuses.

French Sources

In the Regnault play, the girdle is enchanted not by a Jew, as in the ballads and most of the historical accounts, but by the king's Grand Maistre de Garderobbe, Fernand, whose fortune had been much advanced in the court. It is quite possible that Regnault in giving this role to Fernand was thinking of Fernando de Castro, whom all the French accounts mention as the only one of Don Pedro's vassals who remained faithful to him to the end. This very loyalty to Don Pedro would cause him to be looked upon with disfavor by those who condemned his royal master.¹

by an enchanted girdle but by magic potions. The fourteenth century Cuvelier chronicle gives this version, however attributing the enchantment to la dame de Castre, presumably Juana de Castro, and not to María de Padilla:

"Mais la fama mauvaïse qui le roy attrapa,
Par herbes, par venin, si fort l'envenima
Que li rois ne pooit durer ne sà ne là,
S'il ne véoit la fole qui ainsi l'afola;
Et ne pooit véoir celle qui l'espousa.

.....

Mais la dame de Castre, où toute honnour s'aeline,
Avoit souspris le roy par euvre serpentine
Que donné li avoit, dont il prit en hayne
La meilleur, la plus belle, qui estoit si bénigne.
Et bien vosist li roys, qui fu de mal convine,
Qu'elle fust trespassee et mise en feu d'espine;
N'eust cure comment, elle fust mise à morine.
Ainsi avoit béu de l'eaue serpentine,
Du venin du serpent, qui les maulx envenime."

(Op.cit., I, 242 ff.)

Polydore Vergil (loc.cit.) gives the impression that Blanca had herself caused the charm to be placed on the girdle.

¹It is probably due to this same fact, that Cuvelier attributes the enchantments to Fernando de Castro's sister rather than to Maria.

The prominent part played by Henry, the king's brother, in the protestations on behalf of Blanche also points to French sources, the Spanish accounts assigning it to Juan Alfonso de Alburquerque.

Ayala

However, Regnault must have had some familiarity with Ayala. He knows the name of the governor of Medina Sidonia, who is not mentioned by the early French accounts nor Mariana. Regnault writes his name: Dom Estunigue de la Coeva. Ayala says of him:

"É en este tiempo estaba presa la Reyna Doña Blanca de Borbon su muger en Medina Sidonia, é teníale presa Iñigo Ortiz de Estuñiga, que decían de las Cuevas."¹

In the play as in Ayala, he is faithful to the queen.

In representing the queen mother as still Blanche's protectress after nine years, Regnault enlarges on Ayala, who gives her this role upon Blanche's arrival but tells how she was sent back to Portugal by her son after the Toro affair in 1356.² María's lamentations over the fresher charms of a rival that has languished in prison for nine years are rather amusing.

The apparition of the shepherd, an incident already mentioned, is also from Spanish sources, Cuvelier giving only the Merlin prophecy. In addition to the appearance of the shepherd, dreams and omens are given by Regnault which are not from any historical source but are of the type common to the drama of the period not only in France but in other countries as well.

In portraying Marie as a suicide, Regnault is drawing on his imagination. As for the happy ending — Pedro's desertion of his wicked mistress for his virtuous wife — that is due to the

¹Año 12, Cap. 3.

²Año 7, Cap. 2.

exigencies of the tragi-comedy. For the early seventeenth century audience was just as insistent on a cheerful dénouement as the average present-day moving picture public.

General Characteristics

Pedro in this play has his traditional courage. He says to his brother Henry:

"combattans tous deux cent fois en mesme rang,
Tu m'as veu sans trembler cent fois couuert de sang."
(Act IV, Sc. II)

The effect of the charm is to turn him into a madman, therein offering another point of contact with Rotrou's play.

Three of his justicias are mentioned by Henry:

"Je fremy quand je pense aux meurtres que l'on fit
Dans Toro, dans Burgos, et dans Vailladolit."
(Act IV, Sc. IV)

The incidents referred to are the vengeance Don Pedro took after his escape from Toro, when he massacred the queen mother's adherents as they marched out of the castle subsequent to their surrender; the killing of Garcí Lasso at Burgos early in Pedro's reign and perhaps the killing of the two sons of Ferrand Sanchez de Valladolid:

"E fizo el Rey prender ese día a dos hijos de Ferrand Sanchez de Valladolid, que vinieron alli, al uno decian Garcí Ferrandez, é al otro Juan Sanchez: é luego partió el Rey dende, é fuese para Valladolid: é otro día fizolos matar el Rey en Valladolid, por quanto ovo sospecha que eran en fabla con Don Pero Núñez, por unas cartas que falló que se enviaban, aunque ellos se disculpaban."¹

However, since this last is a rather obscure event, Vailladolit may have been mentioned merely to satisfy the exigencies of the rhyme.

Blanche, as has been stated before, is a patient Griselda, who after nine years of imprisonment still worships the king's

¹Ayala, Año 11, Cap. 5.

portrait. Her capacity for self-effacement is shown by her exclamation when Don Pedro is again under the influence of the magic charm:

"Ciel! qui voyez l'estat de ce Prince amoureux,
Donnez-luy par ma perte un sort moins rigoureux,
Souffrez qu'il soit l'Admete, et que ie sois l'Alceste
Qui sauve un si grand Roy d'une mort si funeste,
Pour deux de vos enfants n'en faites perir qu'un:
Et ne frappez que moy dans ce mal-heur commun."

(Act III, Sc. II)

If we are to believe Regnault's own testimony, Blanche de Bourbon was a successful play.¹ However, its chief claim to distinction is its treatment of a phase of the Don Pedro legend not found in any other play which we at present possess.

II

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Toward the end of the eighteenth century and almost simultaneously De Belloy and Voltaire wrote plays on Don Pedro. De Belloy had already presented his play² when he heard that Voltaire was writing one on the same subject. Voltaire in his turn discontinued his work when informed of De Belloy's play but resumed it when he heard that De Belloy had definitely withdrawn his. According to the statement of the publisher,³ Voltaire's play was never intended for presentation on the stage. That both plays deal with the latter part of Don Pedro's reign, is due to the fact that both are based at least partly on medieval French sources,⁴ which begin with the invasion of Enrique and Du Guesclin and end with Pedro's death at Montiel.

¹Cf. the dedication to the 1643 edition: "...sur les Theatres, où elle a paru tant de fois si heureusement."

²1772.

³Épître dédicatoire à M. d'Alembert.

⁴Froissart and Cuvelier.

Voltaire's Don Pèdre

Voltaire shows less directly the influence of these sources than does De Belloy. In fact, his play is far less historical than is that of his contemporary. It reminds one of Lope's Lo cierto por lo dudoso in presenting Don Pèdre and Transtamare as rivals for the hand of the same lady. In the French play, however, the lady loved by both prefers Don Pèdre, not Transtamare. In De Belloy, while we have a similar situation, the lady is Blanche de Bourbon, as in Espronceda's Doña Blanca de Borbón.¹

As might be expected, Voltaire shows his eighteenth century skepticism very clearly in this play. He directs numerous bits of satire at the Pope.² He also reflects eighteenth century theories concerning the rights of the people.³

As Señor Lomba suggests, Voltaire probably had Doña Juana Manuel in mind in depicting Leonore. Alfonso XI had during his life-time betrothed this lady to his bastard son, Enrique, and Enrique's mother, Leonor de Guzmán, afterwards brought about the marriage in spite of Don Pedro's opposition.⁴

The favorable attitude of the later French drama toward Don Pedro is probably due in great part to Voltaire. Both in his play and in the Essai sur les Moeurs, he is the partisan of Don

¹Where Voltaire speaks of Don Pèdre's dragging Léonore after Laure et Padille (Act I), he is doubtless thinking of Le-grand's Roi de Cocagne, imitated from Vélez de Guevara's Reinar después de la muerte, and which treats the Portuguese, not the Spanish Don Pedro.

²E.g. "On le poursuit dans Rome à ce vieux tribunal
Qui, par un long abus, peut-être trop fatal
Sur tant de souverains étend son vaste empire."
(Act I)

³Transtamare says to Don Pèdre:
"Vous n'etes plus qu'un homme avec un titre auguste,
Premier sujet des lois, et forcé d'être juste."
(Act I)

⁴Ayala, Año I, Cap. 12.

Pedro against Enrique de Trastamara, showing great contempt for the bastard fratricide. This dislike of Trastamara we see again in Dumas' Batard de Mauléon.

De Belloy's Pierre le Cruel

While this is by no means a Classical play, De Belloy's purpose in putting the queen's imprisonment at Montiel rather than Medina Sidonia or Jerez de la Frontera was probably to achieve at least approximate unity of place and at the same time bring together in his play Blanche, Du Guesclin and the Black Prince. The happy ending, however,¹ puts the play in the class of the earlier tragi-comedy or the later Mélodrame.

Source

The main source is undoubtedly the Cuvellier chronicle of the life of Du Guesclin, though not necessarily in the original. He might have used either the prose version by Jean d'Estonteville or the seventeenth century paraphrase by Le Febvre.² The details which are obviously from this source are: 1. the fact that Pierre's army is entirely made up of Moslems and Jews; 2. Du Guesclin's ransom — since his wife had given all their money to the poor, the wife of the Black Prince paid it and Du Guesclin used it to ransom others than himself;³ 3. Du Guesclin's being visited by Henri with visor down, though here it happens at Montiel, not at

¹Henri and Blanche are united without even any responsibility for Pierre's death on their consciences.

²Jacques Le Febvre, Anciens Mémoires du XIV^e siècle...où l'on apprend les aventures les plus surprenantes...de la vie du fameux Bertrand Du Guesclin, (Douay, 1692).

³Dumas also tells of Du Guesclin's ransom in the Batard de Mauléon, and A.V. Arnault has written a whole play on the subject, although he puts it before the expedition into Spain. It is found in Act II in De Belloy.

Bordeaux;¹ 4. the suggestion that Pèdre give up his crown to Henri in return for Granada.²

Even Henri's love for Blanche may be an attempt to explain his championship of her, which is dwelt on at great length by Cuvelier and his derivatives.³ The prominent part played by Fernand probably is also due to this source, although Froissart too mentions him as the only one remaining faithful to Don Pedro to the end, as has been previously stated.

Other details De Belloy could not have obtained from these sources and are probably either from Mariana or from Ferreras, both of these works having been translated into French, the first in 1725, the second in 1751. Such are the statement that Pèdre had been previously married to Padille, and that Blanche had been offered him against his will;⁴ mention of the incident at Toledo, where the people had taken Blanca's part against Pèdre, who had come to seize her,⁵ the fact that Pèdre had loved a Pères.⁶

As for Du Guesclin's remark that the people claim the right to elect their king, this is very likely merely an echo of general eighteenth century ideas and not a reference to the supposed letter of Enrique to the Black Prince, in which he founds his right to the throne on this ancient Gothic privilege.⁷

As La Harpe remarks,⁸ Pèdre in this play is a most vile

¹Act II. Dumas (op.cit.) also gives this incident.

²Act V. In Cuvelier he is offered a duchy in exchange for his kingdom.

³In Regnault's play, this protection on his part is disinterested as in the chronicles.

⁴Act II.

⁵Act II.

⁶This was probably Aldonza Coronel, the wife of Alvar Perez de Guzman, since Pèdre is supposed to have snatched her from the arms of her husband. She was one of Pedro's most famous paramours, quartered at the Torre del Oro in Seville, while María occupied the Alcázar.

⁷See p. 33.

⁸Quoted by Lomba, op.cit., p. 267.

and a most abject creature, and it is hard to justify the efforts put forth in his behalf by the Black Prince. The only occasion on which he shows a softer mood, is when after all his crimes Fernand still remains true to him. To save Henri from the opprobrium of being Pèdre's murderer, De Belley has the king kill himself, his dagger slipping as he attacks his brother. Henri is thus left with not a single blemish, to marry Blanche and presumably reign happily ever after.

Arnault's Don Pèdre ou Le roi et
le laboureur

The Author

At the very end of the eighteenth century,¹ Don Pedro again attracted the attention of a French dramatist, that of A. V. Arnault. His play was not presented until 1802 and on its first performance suffered a complete fiasco, perhaps due in part to the author's great unpopularity, for he was hated first as a royalist, then as a demagogue. He justifies himself against the second of these charges in the Épître dédicatoire à ma patrie, written during his exile in 1817 and published in his Théâtre in 1824. However, in spite of this justification, one is left with a suspicion that Arnault was careful to be on good terms with whatever party happened to be in power. As a consequence of the political unrest of the time and Arnault's exile, this play was not published until 1818, when it appeared with a dedication to General Lafayette.

Arnault was a man of considerable learning, being made chief of Public Instruction in 1800. He accompanied the ambassador, Lucien Bonaparte to Madrid, where he became a member of the Aca-

¹In 1799.

demia de la Lengua.

When Dumas père first began to write, Arnault was one of the authors who had a rang in literature in Paris, and Dumas was in fact befriended by him and looked back on his first dinner at that celebrity's house as a great occasion.¹ It is also from Dumas that we learn many amusing anecdotes concerning him and the fact that the great Talma played in his tragedies. Unfortunately, the iriendship between Arnault and Dumas was of short duration, for in 1828, Arnault took up the cudgels in defense of Classicism against Melodrama at the Théâtre Français, and Dumas, as one of the recognized leaders of the Melodramatic movement, naturally became persona non grata to the older writer.² And yet Arnault is not a strict Classicist himself. In fact, he is now considered as one of the successors of Voltaire and Ducis in the development of tragedy into melodrama.³

Sources

El montañés Juan Pascual

The Avertissement states that the play was inspired in Juan Paschal [sic] famosa comedia de un ingenio de esta corte.⁴ However, it was not taken from the play directly but from the analysis of it given by a diplomatic agent. This explains the divergencies between the French play and its Spanish original. For all the extraneous incidents have been clipped from it and with them the traditional elements which give Hoz y Mota's play its fascination. Only the skeleton is left, and we have difficulty

¹Mémoires, V, 165; VI, 17; VIII, 1 and 7.

²Ibid., XII, 152.

³Alexis Pitou, "Les Origines du Mélodrame français à la fin du XVIII^e siècle," Rev. d'Hist. Lit., (1911), XVIII, 257.

⁴It is now generally agreed that Hoz y Mota is the author of this play.

in recognizing the picturesque Don Pedro of Spanish legend. Among the colorful details that one misses are the zapatero y el organista incident,¹ the vieja del candilejo, the cabeza del Rey Don Pedro² and the creaking of the king's bones. María de Padilla, who plays a prominent part in El montañés Juan Pascual, is entirely absent from Le roi et le laboureur and Blanca and Enrique are not mentioned. The absence of the comic element also detracts from the picturesqueness of the play.

Eighteenth Century Ideas

Like Voltaire and De Belloy, Arnault wove many eighteenth century ideas into his play. Such is the picture of domestic bliss which Juan paints for his daughter, and which may owe not a little to such plays as Diderot's Le père de famille. Such is also the charge Juan brings against Don Pedro's government. For here he does not accuse him of cruelty and the liaison with the Padilla as in Hoz y Mota's play but upbraids him for burdening the farmer with a heavy load of taxes. This reminds one of the incident related by Rousseau in his Confessions,³ where a farmer had to hide his wine and bread for fear that it would fall an easy prey to the tax collectors, or Voltaire's discussions on taxation in the Dialogue entre un Philosophe et un Contrôleur Général des Finances. There was much agitation at the time against the system of farming out the taxes.⁴

Juan's insistence on his daughter's duty as a citoyenne

¹There is, however, still a vestige of the justicias of Don Pedro in his rewarding of the soldier, León (Act II), and in the decision concerning his own case.

²In the French play, Juan simply hands a warrant on which his name is inscribed to Don Pedro and asks him to sign it.

³Livre IV.

⁴While there was also trouble over taxation in Don Pedro's reign, it does not stand out very prominently in the history of that epoch, and it is more likely that Arnault had his own time in mind.

is also clearly of the eighteenth century, as is indeed Juan's whole nature. For he is a post-Revolutionary peasant, one who is rather defiantly conscious of his own dignity and importance, which he feels the constant need of defending against the aristocrats. He lacks altogether the geniality of the Spanish Juan, that good-natured and yet respectful familiarity with his superiors which is so characteristic of the Spaniard. In Arnault's play, accordingly, it is Juan himself who insists upon continuing the search for the murderer, while in Hoz y Mota, Juan, knowing that the king is the guilty one, tries hard to shelve the matter; and when Don Pedro will not permit this, and Juan finally reveals him as the criminal, the asistente falls on his knees and asks the royal protection. It is a consequence of this same difference between the seventeenth and the eighteenth century attitude toward royalty, that in Hoz y Mota's play, Juan willingly becomes permanent asistente at Don Pedro's request, while in Arnault's, he refuses disdainfully the king's offer to ennoble him and marry his daughter and returns to his own humble roof.

We find an equally great difference between the Spanish and the French heroine. Leonor is the clinging, helpless creature that Moratín so ably characterized in El sí de las niñas. She is a timid country girl who solicits María de Padilla's protection against the king. Félicie, on the other hand, shows much of her father's pride in the humility of their origin, and in spite of her love for Don Pèdre, refuses to become his queen, not out of humility but out of pride. For while Juan, in Arnault's play, insists that marital happiness is possible only between equals, we feel that he really does not believe that the inferiority is on his side.¹

¹This theme of equality as a condition for happiness in

Influence of Voltaire's Don Pèdre

That Arnault knew Voltaire's Don Pèdre, is probable, not only because of Voltaire's prominence as an eighteenth century dramatist, but because several resemblances to the earlier play can be detected in Le roi et le laboureur. Arnault has in fact appropriated one of Voltaire's courtiers, Almède, who is not historical and must have been invented by the philosopher of Ferney. The closing lines of the two plays also have a certain resemblance. In Voltaire, Transtamare, in Arnault, Don Pèdre, states that he is henceforth doomed to a life of crime.

Le sage dans son retraite

Menéndez y Pelayo¹ called attention to the resemblance between El montañés Juan Pascual, Lope's La carbonera and his El villano en su rincón² in the scene where the king, lost at night while hunting, enters the rustic dwelling of a farmer. Gassier³ had already pointed out the similarity between Dodsley's The king and the miller of Mansfield, Frago's Le sage dans son retraite, Sedaine's Le Roi et le Fermier⁴ and Collé's La Partie de Chasse d'Henri IV⁵ in this situation. Gassier shows that Sedaine got the idea from Dodsley⁶ and that Dodsley in his turn had taken it from Matos Frago. It is likely that Le Souper de Henri IV, ou le Laboureur devenu Gentilhomme⁷ also belongs to this family.

marriage, we find also in Matos Frago's play, El sabio en su retiro, translated by Linguet in 1770, whence Arnault may have taken it directly.

¹Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega, (1923 ed.), IV, 403.

²This was later re-worked by Matos Frago as El sabio en su retiro.

³Le Théâtre espagnol, (Paris, 1898), p. 353.

⁴1762.

⁵1766.

⁶Directly from the Choix de petites pièces du Théâtre anglais, (Paris, 1756).

⁷Cf. Almanach des Muses, (1790).

Arnault's Le roi et le laboureur adds another play to this list, its title as well as its content indicating its relationship. The similarity of the theme makes it likely that Arnault knew Matos Fragoso's play.

Calderon's Alcalde de Zalamea

Not in this particular situation, but in the character of the rustic patriarch in the capacity of judge, Arnault's play offers points of contact with Calderon's Alcalde de Zalamea. This was one of the Spanish plays translated in Linguet's Théâtre, from which it was in turn imitated by Collot,¹ and it is quite possible that Arnault may have been familiar with it. Arnault's Juan has not an only daughter, like Hoz y Mota's, but a son and daughter, as has Crespo, and the son, like Crespo's son, is ambitious to be a soldier.

Reasons for the Unpopularity of the Play

The Avertissement mentions La Fontaine's fable, Le paysan du Danube, where we also have a peasant who tells the king the short-comings of his government. It seems that Arnault's farmer was much criticised for his knowledge of politics, which was considered very unnatural in a person of his humble position. There were those, in fact, who attributed the failure of the play to this real or fancied invraisemblance in the character of Juan. The Avertissement ascribes the success of Hoz y Mota's play in Spain and the failure of Arnault's in France to the difference in taste between the two countries. However, while it is likely that El montañés Juan Pascual would have failed in France, it is not at all certain that Le roi et le laboureur would have been popular in Spain, lacking as it does most of the elements which made the

¹Le Paysan magistrat, 1789.

success of the Spanish play. Arnault himself attributed his fiasco to the unreasonableness of the French public, which is always clamoring for something new, yet always wants the old.¹ He was probably right in part, for it is a well-known fact that the French theater, which earlier in the century had introduced some innovations, during and immediately after the Revolution reverted to a slavish adherence to the Classic rules.²

General Characteristics

The historical part is even more meager in Arnault's than in Hoz y Mota's play. We have only slight hints regarding Don Pedro's cruelty to his family and the character of the courtier Alphonse, who humors Père in order the better to govern him. Arnault probably had in mind Juan Alfonso de Alburquerque, who had brought about the liaison between Don Pedro and María de Padilla, as has been already mentioned.³ The ulterior motives of this diplomat are referred to both by Mariana and Ferreras.⁴ Either of these works, as we know, was easily accessible to Arnault in French translation. Here again Don Pedro is weak, controlled by his courtiers. Like all the Don Pedros conceived by foreign authors, he lacks the positive characteristics of the Don Pedro of Spanish legend.⁵

¹Épître dédicatoire à ma patrie.

²Petit de Julleville, Le Théâtre en France, (Paris, 1889), pp. 333 ff.

³p. 38.

⁴Mariana, Libro 16, Cap. 17; Ferreras, V, 261.

⁵Dumas also tells the story of the Montañés Juan Pascual in his short story Pierre le Cruel. In view of his close friendship with Arnault, it is quite likely that he knew that author's play. He may have heard it read in the literary reunions that were held at Arnault's house. However, Dumas' chief source is not Le roi et le laboureur but Trueba's Romance of History. Dumas repeats the changes introduced by Trueba, namely: Ferran de Castro is Don Pedro's companion in his visit to Juan Pasquale's [sic] house; Juan's wife reproaches him with his lack of circumspection

III

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Romantic Period

While Don Pedro was not chosen as the hero of a play by any of the great French dramatic authors of the Romantic epoch,¹ one is nevertheless reminded of him as one reads some of the drama of the time. E. Martinenche, speaking of the reaction of Spain to Hugo's Hernani, says:

"...c'est sans doute qu'en Espagne on trouvait naturel que Charles I^{er} commençât comme tel ou tel autre roi dont la comedia avait volontiers représenté les premières aventures, comme Pierre le Justicier, par exemple, qui court, lui aussi, les rues dans El médico de su honra et qui se heurte également à des brigands."²

He also sees a resemblance³ to Ganar amigos in the same play -- where Don Carlos protects Hernani's retreat as the Marqués don Fadrique covers that of Don Fernando in Alarcón's play. The very fact that Don Pedro had been treated a number of times in the drama of the eighteenth century may have led the leading dramatists of the Romantic period to turn their attention to other subjects. The evident mediocrity of these eighteenth century Don Pedro dramas

in the conversation with the disguised king and prophecies dire results to come; there is a son Manuel; a Juan de Valverde is immediately arrested for murder by the new Asistente; the girl with whom Don Pedro falls in love is not the daughter of Juan; the man killed by the king is not the zapatero but a guard; the old woman of the candil voluntarily offers her information; the statue is publicly beheaded. Dumas even copies Trueba's error in attributing the story to "Zurita, Annales de Seville." (Ortiz de Zúñiga, not Zurita, is the author of this work.) Dumas has given the story an atmosphere reminiscent of Scott and one is not surprised, after reading it, at his statement that the English Romanticist had produced a great impression upon him.

¹Dumas, as we have seen, wrote a novel and a short story about him.

²Op.cit., p. 121.

³Ibid., p. 123.

may also have contributed to the same result. The Spanish seventeenth century Don Pedro plays were at this time not generally known in France, for neither among the Linguet translations of the Spanish theater nor the later ones of La Beaumelle¹ had any Don Pedro plays been included.² Abel Hugo in 1822 published his Romances historiques, which contained three of the best-known ballads on the subject.³ The ballads, however, are far from presenting as romantic a picture of Don Pedro as was drawn by the seventeenth century Spanish drama. The nearest approach to this representation of him is the Don Pedro of Trueba y Cossío's Romance of History, first written in English but translated into French in 1832,⁴ which led Dumas to write the conte, Pierre le Cruel. A novel, Don Martin Gil, based on the history of Peter the Cruel, was produced in 1831 by a minor author, M. Mortonval. The fact that the reviewer of this work in the Revue de Paris, speaks of "des scènes que Lopez Ayala, le chroniqueur, rapporte avec une si belle et si froide indifférence,"⁵ shows that the fourteenth century chronicler of Don Pedro was not entirely unknown at the time.⁶ Trueba's novel, The Castilian, written originally in English like his Romance of History, was also translated into French shortly

¹1822.

²The Spanish theater, well known in France in the seventeenth century, had been forgotten during the rationalistic eighteenth, a time when Spain was to the French synonymous with bigotry and the Inquisition.

³These or their Spanish originals inspired Dumas's novel, Le Bâtard de Mauléon, 1841.

⁴L'Espagne romantique, contes de l'Histoire d'Espagne, traduit par Ch. A. Defaucompret, (Paris, 1832). In the review of this work, (Revue de Paris, (1832), XLIV), the Légende de Don Pedro received special mention.

⁵(1831), XXV, 200.

⁶Ph. Charles, writing in the Revue de Paris, (1829, pp. 225 ff.), gave a brief summary of Don Pedro's reign (De Don Pedro, roi de Castille, surnommé El Cruel, El Justiciero, El Necesitado; et du chroniqueur Don Lopez Ayala, contemporain de ce prince), mentioning Mariana, Ferreras and other Spanish historians. The title

afterwards under the title of Le Castillan, ou le Prince Noir en Espagne.¹ It is evident, therefore, that the French were showing an interest in the Don Pedro legend, even if this interest was not manifesting itself in the drama.

Epoch of Melodrama

Labrousse and Saint-Ernest's
Don Pèdre le Mendiant (1837)

When Romanticism had already become exaggerated into Melodrama, when prose took the place of verse, when the happy ending became obligatory, virtue inevitably triumphing over vice and the hero over the villain, when love was no longer uncontrolled but sanctioned and in fact sank into secondary importance, when violent antitheses and coups de théâtre had become the rule, when the characters of the drama had degenerated into set types, such as the faithful friend, the clown, the persecuted innocent, the black villain, the perfect hero (who is often himself the object of persecution), when disguises and reconnaisances had become stock devices,² there was produced at the Théâtre de l'Ambigu Comique, a most extravagant melodrama with a most characteristic title, Don Pèdre le Mendiant, in which are exemplified most of the earmarks of the genre just enumerated. It was naturally at the theaters of the Boulevards rather than the Comédie Française that this type of play found a welcome.³

of this article is almost identical with that of the Conde de la Roca's defense of Don Pedro (1648).

¹1829.

²Cf. Alexander Lacey, Pixerécourt and the French Romantic Drama, (Toronto, 1928), p. 21.

³One remembers how even Victor Hugo withdrew his patronage from the National Theater and Mlle. Mars to confer it upon the Porte St. Martin and the young Mme. Dorval, who was just embarking on her brilliant career.

The Authors and the Ambigu-Comique

Théophile Gautier¹ gives us many interesting facts not only about the Ambigu-Comique, but about these two authors, F. Labrousse and Louis-Nicolas Brette, dit Saint-Ernest. He puts the Ambigu-Comique and the Gaieté in the same class, telling how on one occasion² he and some friends drew straws to decide to which of these two places of amusement they would go. Fate decided for the Ambigu-Comique, so there they went. The audience there, he says, was so naïve that sometimes they waited at the stage door after the performance to insult the villain and commend the hero. It is to be regretted that Gautier did not see Don Père le Mendiant and give us the entertaining account of it that he has left us of so many equally heart-rending spectacles given at the same theater. Perhaps Fate decided for the Gaieté on the night this monstrosity was given.

However, we do have from his pen³ a vivid picture of one of the authors, Saint-Ernest, who was actor as well as dramatist. It appears that he and another performer at the same theater had strong lungs, Saint-Ernest rolling all his r's, while the other emphasized all his s's.

"Il arrive un moment," he says, "où le débit s'échauffe au point qu'on n'entend qu'un ronflement d'un côté, et qu'un sifflement de l'autre; toutes les autres voyelles sont absolument supprimées. Voici quelques phrases que nous avons retenues, au moment où l'on pouvait encore distinguer les mots: 'Sais-tu,' disait Saint-Ernest, 'que je n'aurais qu'un mot à dire pour te faire précipiter en bas des murres de cette demeure?'"

It is easy to see how effective he must have been as Don Père. On another occasion, after an ironic resumé of a play in which a dog played an important role, Gautier tells how at the end of the

¹L'Art Dramatique en France depuis Vingt-Cinq Ans.

²I, 142.

³P. 24.

performance Saint-Ernest and the dog receive a curtain call and come out together, Lion offering the actor his paw.

Labrousse he mentions as collaborator in a number of plays of the time. They were all dramas à grand spectacle, like the Mendiant.

The Play — General Sources

Plays having to do with beggars were popular at the time.¹ Don Père has been robbed by the ricos-homes of almost everything he possessed.² In his need, there remain to him his daughter, Isabel, his gracioso and his daughter's lover, Peblo, a Moorish prince who has fallen upon evil days and appears disguised as a poor shepherd. Gracioso and Peblo join forces to foil the wicked ricos-homes, and we have at the end the hall of justice where Don Père metes out just punishment to those who have defrauded him and gives his daughter as bride to the noble young Arab.³ So we have here the clown, already become a type due to the bouffon in Hugo's Le Roi s'amuse and in Musset's Fantasio, the gracieux in Marion de Lorme, etc.⁴ We have also the disguised prince whose identity is later revealed, the persecuted innocent⁵ and the faithful friend — in Gracioso. We have in addition many coups de théâtre, such as the sudden revelation of Peblo as a Moorish

¹A piece by the title of Le Mendiant was given at the Ambigu-Comique in 1828, Les Mendiants at the Théâtre des Variétés, 1829-30 and Le Mendiant in 1831.

²He has nothing left but a caban [gabán]. In the Revue de Paris, (1844), I, 179, another gripping melodrama written by Saint-Ernest is ridiculed. Here we have a merchant cheated by his partner and stripped of everything but un magnifique pantalon nan-kin.

³Arabs were very popular on the French stage about this time, especially at the Porte St. Martin, according to the Revue de Paris, (1836), XXV, 291.

⁴The part played by the clown in this play is rather similar to his role in Fantasio.

⁵Don Père himself.

prince, Peblo's arrival at the hall of justice, having managed to break the chains with which the villain has bound him, the discovery that the beggar at the banquet is the king, etc.

The name Peblo the authors undoubtedly appropriated from the play Peblo, ou le Jardinier de Valence, in which Mme. Dorval made her début in 1831, and which was very popular for a number of years.¹ Gautier says, speaking of Mme. Dorval and Frédéric Lemaitre: "Qui ne les a pas vus ensemble, dans le Joueur par exemple, dans Peblo, ou le Jardinier de Valence, n'a rien vu."²

Historical Sources

Knowing that even the greatest of the Romantic dramatists were not too scrupulous regarding historical accuracy,³ we are not surprised to find those of inferior rank even more careless. It was probably Labrousse rather than Saint-Ernest who did the hurried research in preparation for this drame, for Labrousse has other historical or pseudo-historical plays to his credit. The

¹By 1833 it had become Peblo, ou le Jardinier de Florence at the Théâtre des Folies Dramatiques and by 1837 it was Le Portefaix at the Gymnase.

²Op.cit., VI, 104.

³"Quant à la vérité historique dont les romantiques faisaient si grand état, il va sans dire qu'on ne peut s'attendre sérieusement à la trouver dans des drames, bâclés en quelques semaines, après quelques jours de hâtives recherches, faites d'une main fiévreuse à travers vingt chroniqueurs où l'auteur cueille en courant le détail matériel et pittoresque, et laisse, faute de temps, ce qui est bien plus difficile à comprendre et à dérober, l'âme des siècles éteints et des civilisations disparues." (Petit de Julleville, Le Théâtre en France, p. 383.) Apropos of the swiftness with which the French Romantic dramatists composed, Dumas tells us in his Souvenirs dramatiques et littéraires (p. 120), that Hugo spent a week on Hernani and three days longer on Marion de Lorme. (We know how accurate he himself was — in spite of his assertion that he had drawn his Henri III from the chronicles — from the wrong reference he copied from Trueba. (Cf. p. 64)) Morel Fatio has shown that the technical terms with which Hugo crowded his Ruy Blas, to deceive the reader, came not from the Spanish works he claims as his sources but from two French ones. (Eugène Rigal, Victor Hugo, (Paris, 1900), p. 62).

Scene is laid in Toledo in 1357, which is very likely a mistake for 1367, since Don Pedro is represented as bankrupt. At two periods in his career Pedro was in financial difficulties. Ayala relates¹ how on one occasion — in 1355 — when the king was playing at dados, he remarked that the twenty thousand doblas he had with him were his whole treasure. Simuel el Levi, his treasurer, thereupon proposed to him a method, not too honest, whereby he might soon fill his coffers, a suggestion which Don Pedro accepted with alacrity.² It is more likely, however, that Labrousse had in mind the other period of Don Pedro's financial embarrassment, for it was better known. This was in 1367 after the battle of Nájera when the Black Prince was demanding money to pay his troops, money which Don Pedro found it impossible to raise. This situation, unlike the earlier one, is described by all the historians who have treated of the Castilian Peter, and our authors could not very well have missed it, no matter how meager their reading on the subject might have been.

The main historical source was probably Dillon,³ for Don Gomez de Maurique, the arch-villain, threatens Don Pèdre: "Roi de Castille! du haut d'une galère pontificale le légat du pape te jettera bientôt l'excommunication!" (Act IV) and the king answers: "Je lancerai mon cheval si avant dans le fleuve, que j'atteindrai le messenger de malheur..." Ayala says nothing of this incident, but we find it in the Cuarta Crónica General where it is told as follows:

"...andando por orilla del rio Guadalquivir acerca de

¹Año 6, Cap. 15.

²This incident is described in Juan Arolas, ¿A cuál de las dos?

³John Talbot Dillon, History of the Reign of Peter the Cruel, king of Castile and Leon, (London, 1788), translated into French in 1790.

Tablada, vino ende río arriba una galeota, en la qual venia un Arcediano de corte de Roma, el qual dicho Arcediano sabía muy bien quel Rey Don Pedro andaba cada día cavalgando por allí: é dixo á los que con el dicho Rey andaban, que dixesen al Rey que se llegase á la orilla del río, y que le daría nuevas de las partes de levante. Y el Rey se llegó á la orilla del río, y el Arcediano le preguntó, si él era el Rey Don Pedro; y él dixo que sí. El qual dicho Arcediano leyó luego una carta del Santo Padre que por estonce era, la qual le pronunciaba por descomulgado en todos sus Regnos y señoríos, y esto porque el dicho Rey avia mandado matar poco avia al Maestre de San Bernaldo, y le avia quitado todas sus villas é logares que tenia que eran de la Orden, las quales son Behetrías que están en Castilla, esto porque avia ayudado al Rey Don Enrique su hermano contra él, é otrosí porque avia fecho desposseer á los Obispos de la...y luego avia puesto otros Obispos, non se pudiendo meter en lo Eclesiastico. Y el Rey Don Pedro como lo oyó dió de espuelas al caballo, y saltó en el río, y con su espada fué por dar al Arcediano con ella...¹

Mariana and Ortiz de Zúñiga obtained the story from this source. Dillon relates it,² saying it happened in 1359. He gives Zurita as his source, doubtless confusing him with Ortiz de Zúñiga, who puts the occurrence in this year, Zurita not mentioning it at all.

A circumstance that points to Dillon rather than Mariana as the source of Don Pèdre le Mendiant is the fact that the English historian uses the words ricos-homes and behetrías, giving a long discussion on the second of these terms. Labrousse and Saint-Ernest, in accordance with the pretense at historical accuracy characteristic of the time, an accuracy which authors attempted to prove by the use of technical terms and words calculated to impart atmosphere, make repeated use of these two expressions. They mistake the meaning of the second of these terms, again a sign of the superficiality of their study. For the behetrías were groups of cities under an overlord to whom they paid certain contributions, and who in turn represented them in the Cortes. Our dramatists of the Ambigu-Comique take the word as representing the contribution itself and give us a very pathetic

¹Crónicas de los Reyes de España, III, 71.

²Op.cit., I, 159.

scene in which the merchants take the behetrías and the redeemed caban to the palace in order that the king may pay his debts and re-establish his independence.

The fact that Dillon is a defender of Don Pedro, attributing his cruelties to the necessity of keeping his rebellious nobles in check, also makes it likely that our authors knew his work. Beruquilla, the spokeswoman of the merchants, goes so far as to give a ridiculous picture of Don Pèdre's nobility of soul:

"Oh! mon Dieu!" she exclaims, "pourquoi les as-tu faits si bornés! les misérables, ils ne comprennent pas ce roi, qui, entouré de gardes et de la royale puissance, renonce à tout, aux richesses, aux grandeurs, et préfère la justice à l'opulence acquise au prix de la force et de la violence... Pèdre de Castille, ils ne te comprendront jamais." (Act I)

Here Don Pèdre has an only daughter, Isabel,² whose love affair is a side-issue in the play. The authors invent a law, according to which the king's daughter must marry one of her countrymen. Don Pèdre permits Isabel to choose her husband, provided only that she shall not select a rico-home. Her preference for the Moor pleases him and the marriage is arranged.³

The last act takes place in Don Pèdre's salle de justice. We have no consejas as in Lope's Audiencias, etc. In fact, only one case comes up, that of the ricos-homes, all of whom are condemned to death. The tradition of Don Pedro as a dispenser of justice the authors may have gotten from Trueba's Romance of History, already mentioned, or from Calderón's El Médico de su Honra, which had been translated by this time.⁴ Isabel says⁵ that when

¹The merchants, who refuse to give the king further credit.

²Among Don Pedro's numerous children there was historically a daughter, Isabel, who married a younger son of the king of England.

³Typical of the anachronisms of the period is the presentation of Pèdre as a dernier rejeton of the Boabdils.

⁴1835. In Dumas' Bâtard de Mauléon Blanca's executioner gives her a resumé of this play.

⁵Act IV.

a child she had attended trials of the Justicier in the arms of her mother.

A number of the ricos-homes are historical, such as: Gomez de Maurique, grand-prieur¹ of Toledo; Osorio² and Ponce de Leon.³ These are all mentioned by Dillon. The remaining characters are imaginary.⁴

It is clear from the above analysis that Don Pèdre le Mendiant is of importance only as an indication that the Don Pedro legend, even in a distorted form, was still alive in France in 1837, and not for any literary excellence possessed by it.

Continuation of Interest in Don Pedro

Don Pedro continued to interest the French after this period. In 1841 were published Romances espagnoles relatives à Pierre-le-Cruel as well as Dumas' Pierre le Cruel, already mentioned. In 1843 was presented and in 1844, published, Hippolyte Lucas' adaptation of Le médecin de son honneur. In 1843 also appeared Blanche de Bourbon, ou Reine et martyre, Chronique du XIV^e siècle.⁵ Dumas' Bâtard de Mauléon came in 1846 and Prosper Mérimée's Histoire de Don Pèdre I in 1848. Since the Romances históricos of the Duque de Rivas, published in France in 1841, were not translated, they probably exerted no influence directly. However, Antoine de Latour in his Études sur l'Espagne⁶ relates that poet's

¹He was actually arch-bishop of Toledo.

²A Pero Alvarez de Osorio was put to death in 1360 for having aided Enrique in killing many Jews. (Ayala, Año 11, Cap.5)

³Executed in 1367 for being a partisan of Enrique. (Ibid., Año 18, Cap. XXVII)

⁴That the authors knew no Spanish is evident from such names as De Castelnuovo and the fact that a servant explains that Francesco is the Spanish equivalent of François. (Act III) The word Gracioso had already become common, as is shown by its appearance in the Biographie Universelle in a discussion of Calderón's plays.

⁵Published at Versailles, 1843. ⁶(Paris, 1855), p. 129.

version of the Cabeza del Rey Don Pedro legend. This study seems to be a source of the comic opera Don Pèdre by Cormon and Grangé, which was produced at the Opéra-Comique in 1857.

Cormon and Grangé's Don Pèdre¹

The Authors

Cormon's real name was Pierre-Etienne Piestre. He had taken the name of his mother, who belonged to a family of libraires as a pseudonym. Albert Soubies speaks of him as "l'auteur de tant de mélodrames et de librettes applaudis."² The best-known of these, most of them written in collaboration, are Corneille et Rotrou, the Roman Comique, a farce based on Scarron's novel³ and Les deux orphelins. Eugène Grangé, in addition to collaborating on a large number of operettas and reviews, most of which are forgotten, wrote political verse and chansons.

The Comic Opera

There are two principal versions of the Cabeza del Rey Don Pedro legend. One is that of Ortiz y Zúñiga, in which no love story intervenes, the king while roaming about the city killing a man he happens to encounter. This is the form followed by the Duque de Rivas in Una Antigualla de Sevilla and related by Mérimée in his history⁴ and by the Biographie Universelle.⁵ The other is

¹Cormon et E. Grangé, Don Pèdre, Opéra-Comique en trois actes, musique de M. Ferdinand Poise. Représenté pour la première fois, à Paris, sur le théâtre impérial de l'Opéra-Comique, le 30 septembre, 1857. Paris, 1857.

²La Comédie-Française depuis l'Époque Romantique, (Paris, 1895), p. 122.

³Gautier speaks well of both of these. (Op.cit., IV, 125.)

⁴(Paris, 1865 ed.), p. 123.

⁵1823.

that of El montañés Juan Pascual, where the judge is Juan Pascual, primer asistente of Seville, and where Don Pedro in pursuit of a love affair kills his man. This second version is followed by Trueba, Duras, etc. The two branches of the tradition were modified and combined by later authors, among them Cormon and Grangé. While they omit Juan Pascual, they yet represent the duel as occurring between Don Pedro and a rival in an amorous rendezvous. They probably had read Trueba's Romance of History or Dumas' conte or both. Since they call the judge an alcalde, they must also have known either the Duque de Rivas' Antigualla de Sevilla directly or a paraphrase of that account.¹ Latour's work, which had come out just two years earlier, may well have been the source utilized for this detail.

Cormon and Grangé, however, have made another modification or amplification of the story. They have added a law against duelling, supposedly enacted by Don Pèdre himself and which he was the first to break. This element they may have appropriated from Hugo's Marion de Lorme where Louis XI enacts such a law and where the decree is announced by the town crier as in Cormon and Grangé. In both the defeated combatant is wounded, not killed. This circumstance distinguishes the Cormon and Grangé play from other versions of the Cabeza del Rey don Pedro legend.

The intrigue repeats the old situation of the elderly guardian in love with a beautiful young ward. This type of plot was extremely popular in France in the seventeenth century, but Beaumarchais' Barber of Seville was probably Cormon and Grangé's immediate source, as this play was still a favorite at the period. The guardian in Don Pèdre is the alcade; the ward is Neredha, a

¹Mérimée represents the decision in the matter as being made by the alguazila.

converted Moorish girl; the guardian's rival is the young sculptor Fabio, whose statue of the king is about to be unveiled. But there is also another lover, the king. It is he and Fabio who fight the duel under the girl's window, Don Père wounding his opponent. Here a wily Jew, Issacar, not the vieja del candilejo, informs the alcade that the king is the guilty one, and it is Fabio who suggests a way out of the difficulty — the king had said that unless the guilty man was discovered within an hour, the alcade was to be sent to the dungeon of San Miguel to learn his métier.¹ All is made ready for the unveiling of the king's statue on the grande place de Tolède.² When Don Père appears the alcade tells him he has discovered the criminal but that he is of too exalted a position for any but the monarch himself to punish, and he points to the statue. The king takes the mallet and whacks off the wrist of his stone image — for here the punishment was to be the loss of a hand, not decapitation as in the Spanish versions. The picture of a public execution performed on the statue originated with Trueba, from whom others imitated it.³

Don Pedro here is again very genial. He forgives Fabio and gives him Neredha. Poor Issacar, however, is sentenced to trente coups de bâton.⁴

The historical details are slight. María de Padilla is mentioned by Don Père, who says of her: "Je l'ai chassé ce matin."

¹Act II.

²The authors have shifted the scene of the tradition from Seville to Toledo.

³Cf. Dumas, Pierre le Cruel. Juan Arolas' El Rey y el Alcalde, like the Cormon and Grange play, has an alcalde, not the asistente Juan Pascual, but mentions a love affair. In this work the king is shown his portrait, and he then states that he will have a bust of himself made and placed on the spot where the crime was committed.

⁴Act III. This sentence, pronounced against the informer, is similar to the judgment in Fernández y González' Piel de la justicia.

There is a Don Tello who, however, is not the king's brother but merely a courtier. The Rodriguez who summons the alcade to the council meeting is probably Men Rodríguez de Sanabria. The authors could have read of him either in Mérimée or in Trueba.

The usual effort toward local color is made. We have the Place Mayor at Tolède, where are sold armes du plus pur acier and pomegranates at a maravédís apiece.¹ The songs interspersed are rather clever.

Don Pedro after the Romantic Period

The advent of Realism, as might be expected, ended the interest in Don Pedro as well as in other legendary heroes. The Parnassian reaction produced an epic revival of him by Leconte de Lisle in his Les Inquiétudes de Don Simuel, Le Romance de Don Fadrique and Le Romance de Doña Blanca but does not seem to have presented him on the stage.

IV

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, the interest in Peter the Cruel of Castile, while never as great as that evinced in another Spanish legend, that of Don Juan, was continuous in France from the seventeenth century to the late nineteenth. That this interest did not produce an outstanding drama was due partly to the French rules of dramatic composition, partly to the nature of the subject and partly to the fact that the best of Lope's plays on Don Pedro were not translated into French until too late for them to exert much influence.

¹Act I.

PART III

GERMAN DON PEDRO DRAMA

The few legendary elements which we see still preserved in the French drama have vanished entirely in the German. Even the Juan Pascual tradition and the cabeza del Rey Don Pedro are gone, thus showing again the subjective character of the German national genius, which concerns itself not with concrete externals but with abstract inner forces. The two German dramatists who treated the subject¹ were interested in its psychological and political aspects. They philosophized not only concerning Don Pedro himself but also concerning the persons who surrounded him and the political situation in which he found himself. The sources were historical accounts and Voltaire's play.

Grillparzer's Blanka von Kastilien²

In Germany Don Pedro did not appear in the drama until

¹While there are only two known German plays on Don Pedro, (the Blanca von Bourbon which Sauer mentions in the Vorbemerkungen to Abt II, 1 of his edition of Grillparzer's works as having been presented in Dresden in 1860 may have been Grillparzer's play), the subject was treated in other literary forms such as the novel: Ludwig von Alvensleben, Die Tochter des Piraten. Historische Novelle aus den Zeiten Pedros des Grausamen, (Nürnberg, 1831); in a number of poems: Heine, Romanzero; Lohenstein, Heroiden; J.N. Vogl, Blanka und Pedro, vier Romanzen; Justus Frey, Königsrache; Julius von der Traun, Toledanerklängen. There were also translations of various foreign works on the subject. Calderón's El médico de su honra was rendered as Der Arzt seiner Ehre by J.D. Gries in 1815 and as Don Gutierre (Arzt seiner Ehre) by Schreyvogel in 1834; Moreto's Ricohombre de Alcalá as Der ritterliche Richter by C.A. Dohrm in 1841; Lope's Carbonera as Die Köhlerin by Jul. Graf von Soden in 1819; Trueba's Castilian as Der Kastilianer by Gottfried Wilhelm Becker in 1825; Mortonval's Martin Gil as Don Pedros Rache by Lauritz Kruse in 1833. Three of the romances, Duran 972, 975 and 966, were translated by Emanuel Geibel in 1860.

²Written 1806-1809. Cf. p. 24 ff. on this title. Grillparzer designates the heroine in four different ways: Blanka von Kastilien in the title, Blanca von Bourbon in the first version of the cast of characters, Blanka von Bourbon in the second version and B.d.C. (evidently meant for Blanca de Castilla in his Diary (Aug. 14, 1810).

the beginning of the nineteenth century when Franz Grillparzer, who was later to interest himself so deeply in Lope de Vega and who at the time was barely fifteen years old, chose him or rather his queen, Blanca, as the subject of a tragedy.¹ While this work betrays the immaturity of its author in construction and character study, it already foreshadows the literary greatness that was to be. There are fine lyric passages of which an older writer might well have been proud. Chronologically, Grillparzer belongs to the Romantic period. And in spite of the great contempt with which he looked upon the writers of the Romantic school, Blanka von Kastilien has more than one trait in common with their productions. Such are the secret passageway through which Fedriko would have Blanca escape; the lyric love element so prominent throughout, the medieval subject, etc. To be sure, it was not these particular elements of which the poet disapproved in the work of the Romanticists but their melancholy and the general unhealthiness of their outlook upon life.

Composition

Grillparzer relates in his Autobiography how, inspired by Schiller's plays in general and by Don Carlos in particular, he undertook to write a tragedy himself, choosing as his subject the murder of Blanca, wife of Peter the Cruel of Castile.

"I did not hurry," he says, "working on it a long time, always with Don Carlos in mind, with which it moreover had two faults in common, namely that I changed the plan in the middle and that it got so long that it would have taken all of two evenings to present it. When it was finished, I laid it aside without showing it to anyone, not even my father, since I thought him averse to such occupations."²

¹Already in the late eighteenth century, K.A.W. Spalding had written the history of Don Pedro's reign (Peter der Grausame, König von Kastilien, (Berlin, 1797)).

²Translated from Ludwig Boeck and Wilhelm Englmann, (Vienna, 1923) ed., p. 39.

The change in plan of which he speaks was due to the fact that the work was dropped after the completion of the first act and only resumed after a considerable interval. As he had then become more mature, his original plan was no longer adequate. He therefore developed a new one, changing facts and characters. However, partly out of indolence, partly because he was too well pleased with what he had written to sacrifice any portion of it, he continued with the second act instead of previously reworking the first. The result was that the play when completed lacked unity.¹

The difficulties which confronted the boy poet in the composition of this work were so great that he often became skeptical of his own capacity as a dramatist.

"I often doubt whether I have any talent for dramatic poetry," he laments; "the first act of Blanka von Kastilien convinces me quite distinctly of the contrary. Or can it be that I am too young for this branch of poetic art?"²

With the pessimism so characteristic of youth, he looked upon the death of the popular actress, Madame Roose, in 1808 as spelling the doom of his production. This we see from a short entry in his diary which shows us too that his work on Blanka had been anything but a pleasure to him:

"Madame Roose is dead and with her my fairest hopes! — Blanka von Kastilien can never be played, nor Robert³ either and who knows what besides! — It is very sad! I never enjoyed work on the first, and now it has become an absolute burden to me."⁴

Shortly after the completion of the play, Grillparzer's father died, leaving his family in somewhat embarrassed circum-

¹Diary, Sept. 5, 1817.

²Ibid., early in June, 1808.

³Robert von der Normandie, on which he was working at the same time.

⁴Oct. 24, 1808.

stances. It occurred to the young poet that his play might yield some ready cash, and he accordingly copied and corrected it with the help of some friends and turned it over to his uncle, who was Theatersekretär of the Burgtheater. It was rejected because of its length.

Resumé of the Play

We have in Grillparzer's work again Blanka and Fadrique, or rather Fedriko, as lovers. The circumstances of their first meeting are very romantic. It takes place at Varennes, near Moulins.¹ While Blanca looks on, Fedriko² saves a peasant boy from drowning, thereby almost losing his own life. The following day, he and Blanca both go to the boy's home to inquire after him and become so absorbed in each other's presence that they are entirely unconscious of the gathering storm. They go out together, are overtaken by the thundershower, take shelter in a cave and are rescued by Blanca's attendants. They have several secret meetings after this, each still ignorant of the other's identity, when suddenly Fedriko disappears, leaving only a note behind. We learn later that he had returned home to save his country from civil war.

All this had happened previous to the action of the play itself, and we learn of it in the usual manner through a conversation between Blanca and her confidante. At the beginning of the first act, we find Fedriko in charge of the castle of Xeres de la

¹Grillparzer in localizing the scene in the historical home of the Bourbons reminds one of the praise meted out to him one day in the History class at the University. In an examination on the commercial routes of the ancients, the professor recommended Grillparzer's method of study, having gathered from his tracing with his fingers on the school bench that he had studied with the aid of a map. (Selbstbiographie, Ludwig Böck ed., (Vienna, 1923), p. 32.

²Grillparzer does not tell us why he happens to be there.

Frontera, where he has been sent to receive and guard Don Pedro's unloved queen, of whose identity with his former sweetheart he is of course unaware. When the two meet again, the action becomes a struggle between Blanca's desire to remain true to her marriage vows and Fedriko's determination to save her from her husband's fury. This is constantly fanned by Rodrigo Padilla, who realizes that his own power is entirely dependent upon his sister's continuance as the king's mistress. The dénouement is the murder of Fedriko and Blanca, the suicide of María de Padilla and the remorse of Don Pedro, who had fallen in love with Blanca. We see in this play that even in his youth Grillparzer justified A.W. Schlegel's epigram:

"Wo Grillen mit den Parzen sich vereinen,
Da müssen grause Trauerspiel' erscheinen."

Schlegel, however, probably did not know Blanka von Kastilien, as this work was not published until much later.

Characters

It was the character of María de Padilla that offered Grillparzer the greatest difficulty. He expresses himself on the matter at considerable length in his diary:

"No matter what I do, I cannot decide on the character of María de Padilla. At every new speech I change it. It is determined: her leading characteristic is to be lust for power ... It is not so much covetousness as depravity which bound her to the king at the beginning, an untamed desire to be important, to be known (famous or notorious, it did not matter), to be feared, to rule. Her brother for selfish motives fostered this inclination more and more. All the sins of which she later becomes guilty are an outgrowth of this trait of character. When she realizes that the king is about to lose his kingdom she wishes to leave him, for, since that which bound her to him — his crown — is now lost, what can hold her? She had never loved him. Now every reason for remaining with him has disappeared. If Pedro had been a hero, she perhaps would not have left him. For in that case her imagination, her romanesque ideas would have urged her to stay. But to die by the side of this miserable weakling, a sacrifice to Pedro, had not the appearance of greatness, but of weakness and folly. Her brother persuades her that Pedro's situation is not nearly

so desperate as she thinks, that to flee under these circumstances means yielding to her rival. Then the king sees Blanca for the first time and her beauty makes a deep impression on his weak senses, as any other pretty face would have done. Now María must decide to murder Blanca. Is this resolution in keeping with her character? She is not cruel, not vicious, only eager for power, and to this trait is to be traced her acquiescence in her brother's plan. — But enough, and more than enough,"¹

he concludes. This was his later plan; his original one had made her leading characteristic Neigung zum Grossen. His first conception of her was therefore much more favorable than his later one.

Don Pedro Grillparzer has turned into a weak sensualist, a gourmand who sacrifices his crown to the pleasures of the table:

"Für schwelgerische rohe Tafelfreuden
Hat die ererbte Kron' er hingegeben," (Act III, Sc.1)

María says of him, thus contradicting completely Ayala's picture:
"Era muy temprado é bien acostumbrado en el comer é beber."² And she speaks of him in still more contemptuous terms:

"Ich verachte
dies königliche Wiegenkind das sich
dem Arm der Wärterin entrissen wähnt
und tölpelhaft mit unbeson'nem Muth
zertrümmert was er nur erreichen kann." (Ibid.)

Only the dramatists of his own country have succeeded in representing Don Pedro as he lives in Spanish tradition.

Blanca, on the other hand, Grillparzer has depicted with more character than is usually credited to her. In spite of her love for Fedriko and her husband's unworthiness, she is true to her marriage vows, not as a patient Griselda,³ but from a sense of personal dignity and the desire to save her adopted country from civil war.

¹Sämtliche Werke, (Wien, 1909), Part II (VII), pp. 20 ff.

²Año 20, Cap. 8.

³Cf. Regnault's Blanche de Bourbon.

Sources

Heinrich Keidel¹ gives a highly improbable hypothesis concerning the origin of this play. He suggests that the young poet knew nothing of the rumored love affair between Blanca and Pedro's brother Fadrique, but that he substituted Don Fedriko for another brother, Don Tello, and invented the love affair. This is crediting the great poet with a degree of naïveté he was far from possessing, even at the age of fifteen. For we must remember that he was already a student at the university, that History was his favorite subject and that in his early boyhood he had read and re-read Guthrie and Gray's History of the World, a work which mentions the tradition.²

August Sauer³ had previously given a far more reasonable explanation of the matter. He stated that the incident may have been known to Grillparzer through a number of sources, among which he mentions the Austrian translation of the Guthrie and Gray,⁴ Voltaire's Essai sur les Moeurs,⁵ Spalding's Peter der Grausame, Talbot-Dillon⁶ and Ferreras.⁷ However, he is wrong in his statement that Mariana knew nothing of the affair. That historian

¹Historische Quellen, literarische Vorlagen und Anregungen zu den dramatischen Versuchen des jungen Grillparzer, Dissertation, (Münster, 1911), pp. 14 ff.

²Keidel is also mistaken in supposing that Grillparzer had chosen the Toro affair as the subject of his play. If this had been the case, he would most certainly not have omitted the queen mother from the action, since her part in that incident was so important. No, Grillparzer was trying to do what others had attempted before him — to fuse into a whole the most dramatic occurrences in Don Pedro's life.

³"Vorbemerkungen," Grillparzer's Sämmtliche Werke, (1909), Part II, I, xxv ff.

⁴1785-1792.

⁵(Paris, 1827 ed.), II, Chap. 77.

⁶History of the Reign of Peter the Cruel, German translation (1790).

⁷Allgemeine Historie von Spanien, (Halle, 1754).

speaks of the rumor, at the same time emphasizing his lack of credence in it.¹ Sauer concludes that Grillparzer's sources were the portion of the Guthrie and Gray written by Ritter² and Spalding's history.

That the German dramatist did not use either Ayala or the Spanish version of Mariana is clear from the fact that he writes Heinrich rather than Enrique and instead of the form Fadrique has Friedrich, Fedrigio, Federigo, Federiko and Fedriko. For his use of such forms as Don Pedro, Fernando de Gomez, Diego de Robledo, etc. makes it evident that he was making an effort to employ Hispanic forms and would have written Fadrique had he known of it. Sauer admits that the results of his inner analysis do not preclude the possibility that Grillparzer may have used Ferreras in translation but doubts that the poet had at this early age extended his studies so widely.

Grillparzer misunderstands Ritter or Spalding in representing María de Padilla as Blanca's lady-in-waiting and Pedro as meeting her for the first time in his wife's anteroom. Ritter, in stating that she was among the queen mother's attendants,³ in his turn must have misinterpreted an ambiguous statement in some previous historian, Spalding following him in his error.⁴ According to Ayala, she was a member of Albuquerque's household:

"É en este tiempo, yendo el Rey a Gijón, tomó a Doña Maria de Padilla, que era una doncella muy hermosa, é andaba en casa de Doña Isabel de Meneses, muger de Don Juan Alfonso de Alburquerque, que la criaba."⁵

¹Libro 16, Cap. 18.

²In the Austrian translation or rather adaptation of this English work, the part dealing with Peter the Cruel was treated twice: first by Johann D. Ritter and again by Johann A. Dieze.

³(1772 German ed.), Part V, II, 714.

⁴Op.cit., p. 19.

⁵Año 3, Cap. 5.

The Cuarta Crónica offers still another version, namely that she was living with a relative by the name of Diego Fernández de Quiñones.¹

It was not ignorance on Grillparzer's part that caused him to make María's brother the panderer in place of her uncle, for in the second and third versions of the cast of characters we read Rodrigo de Padilla, ihr Oheim, and yet he is still the brother in the play itself. The author hesitated between the historical inaccuracy of assigning this rôle to the brother and the other error of presenting the uncle as still alive at the time of María's death. There probably is no significance in the name Rodrigo itself. It is not likely that Grillparzer knew the ballad² in which María's brother is so called, even if his knowledge of Spanish was equal to the task of reading it. For it is included neither in the Romancero general nor the Cancionero de romances, the Spanish ballad collections mentioned by certain authors of the period.³ The probability is that the German dramatist wrote Rodrigo instead of Diego García, just as he wrote Diego de Robledo (instead of Juan Pérez de Rebolledo⁴), Luis de Haro and Alonso de Lara, combining surnames well known in Don Pedro's time with Christian names of his own invention or using names which belonged to other periods of Spanish history and were familiar to him.⁵

The idea of Pedro as a bastard⁶ Grillparzer probably got

¹Llaguno ed., p. 60, note.

²Durán 974.

³Herder uses the Cancionero de romances for his translations in Stimmen der Völker and Bertuch mentions the Antwerp, 1568 edition in his Magazin (Weimar, 1789), I. Bouterwek discusses the Romancero general in Geschichte der spanischen Poesie und Beredsamkeit (1804).

⁴Ferreras transformed Ayala's Rebolledo (the ballestero who is supposed to have killed Blanca) into Robledo, an alteration that was followed by Ritter and Spalding.

⁵Luis de Haro, for instance, was the celebrated son of the famous Olivares.

⁶Pedriko calls him so (Act IV, Sc. 8).

either from Dillon¹ or Mariana,² for it is not to be supposed that the young poet had consulted Froissart or Cuvelier.

Grillparzer's Knowledge of Spanish

While Grillparzer does not seem to have used a Spanish source, it is likely that his knowledge of the language at this period was greater than has been generally admitted. He finished Blanka von Kastilien shortly before his father's death.³ The following August he writes, "Hoy me rendió mi Tío José S. mi B.d.C."⁴ In his Autobiography he gives an account of his Spanish studies:

"In spite of my poor memory, I had acquired Italian and English in addition to the two ancient languages and the necessary French one, and my attention being attracted by Bertuch's translation of Don Quixote and his utterances on the Spanish poets, I also occupied myself with this language from my earliest years. I had laid hands on an extremely old Spanish grammar, so ancient that it antedated even the speech of Lope de Vega and Calderón, and I later had to correct the forms I had learned from it. Because of lack of money I could not procure a dictionary until I happened upon a Sobrino⁵ in which, to be sure, the whole letter A was missing but which because of this was to be had for a paper Gulden. With this equipment not much was to be accomplished. Then appeared Schlegel's translation of several of Calderón's plays,⁶ in which the Andacht zum Kreuze interested me especially.⁷

The translation seemed to him very poor, and he threw himself into the study of Spanish, translating half of the first act of La vida es sueño as an exercise. We see from this account that he had already begun the study of the language before the appearance of Schlegel's translation, that is before 1803. And we are given the impression that shortly after this he began work at it in earnest.

¹Op.cit., II, 116.

²See p. 17.

³Nov. 10, 1809.

⁴Diary, Aug. 14, 1810.

⁵Francisco Sobrino, Diccionario nuevo de las lenguas española y francesa (1705).

⁶Spanisches Theater, (Berlin, 1803-1809).

⁷P. 68.

F. Ismar's König Pedro¹

Some twenty years after Grillparzer's youthful effort, another German writer, F. Ismar, tried his hand at a Don Pedro drama. He had found inspiration in the words, novi regis an procerum culpa in ambiguo of the Latin version of Mariana's history.² The Spanish translation of this whole passage, with which Mariana begins his account of Don Pedro's reign, is as follows:

"Siguiéronse en Castilla bravos torbellinos, furiosas tempestades, varios ecaecimeintos, crueles y sangrientas guerras, engaños, traiciones, destierros, muertes sin número y sin cuento, muchos grandes señores violentamente muertos, muchas guerras civiles, ningún cuidado de las cosas sagradas ni profanas; todos estos desórdenes, si por culpa del nuevo Rey, si de los grandes, no se averigua."

Ismar writes an apology in dramatic form both of Don Pedro and his brother Enrique, or rather Enrico.³ History, he says in his Vorrede, condemns both brothers, but history judges according to the letter of the law and is therefore unjust. He tries "to make two notorious characters more virtuous" and this, he declares, is more difficult than to depict "depraved creatures." Unfortunately, in order to give greater virtue to the characters he had chosen to portray, he was compelled to change the facts of history, and this is hardly justifiable in a drama that purports to be historical. Thus he tries to save Enrico from the guilt of fratricide, as De Belloy had done before him, only that in this case the king is murdered by the son of a man who had been put to death by his or-

¹Trauerspiel in fünf Akten, (Hamburg, 1829).

²Libro 16, Cap. 16.

³Ismar is stronger in Italian than he is in Spanish. In foot-notes he gives hints on the pronunciation of certain Spanish sounds: e.g. "nn or ñ is pronounced like nj, as Nunjez, and the z not hard like ts, as the Italians pronounce it, but like the sz of the Germans" (p. 68). He also explains the pronunciation of II, c and g and the word Siguencia. By these explanations and his renderings of Mariana's Latinized names, he reveals his unfamiliarity with the language.

ders. So quickly does the real murderer make his escape that everyone, including Don Pedro himself, thinks it is his brother who struck the fatal blow. In like manner, Ismar attributes to Don Pedro's ambitious favorites the responsibility for all his crimes, even his divorce from Blanca and her death. The arch-villains are Don Sanzio, Bischof von Abula (Ávila), one of the churchmen who brought about the divorce, García Manrique and Juan de Inestrosa, uncle of María de Padilla. María herself does not appear, nor does her brother, who, as we have seen, was Grillparzer's villain.

The circumstance that in this play it is Enrico and not Fadrique who plays the leading part as rival to Don Pedro, classes it with Lope's Lo cierto por lo dudoso, Espronceda's Blanca de Borbón, De Belloy's Pierre le Cruel, and Voltaire's Don Pèdre.

The play is highly romantic, the author taking the opportunity to introduce into it what he knows or has heard of Spanish legend and the picturesqueness of Spanish customs. So he presents a Countess Vivar, descended from the Cid, a Moorish gipsy girl, a band of young people dancing the bolero to an accompaniment of tambourines and castanets, a bull fight. And as in so many other plays of the period, there is a troubadour, here singing the song of König Roderich. There is also a Yago from Santillana.¹

The action is very involved, in fact confusing. The characters are constantly making elliptical and hazy prophetic speeches which are unintelligible to the reader and would be even more so to an audience. We have the unscrupulous nobles plotting against the various women in Don Pedro's life and against each other; also the rivalry between the king and Enrico for Leonore's love, which

¹ Ismar must have read Gil Blas.

finally made them enemies. Don Pedro is depicted as very much of a Don Juan, who in addition to already having a wife and a mistress is wooing Leonore and pursuing a peasant girl. Don Pedro's justice, however, is also emphasized.

In Ismar's play it is Inestrosa who plants in the king's mind a suspicion regarding Bianca's relations with Fadrique, a suspicion which is unfounded, however. Ismar does what no dramatist had done before him, namely, presents the supposed child of this union, whom he calls Enriquez. Here the child is the son of Fadrique and la Palomba and is brought to Bianca by the Countess of Vivar, who says his mother has been imprisoned. Don Pedro, his mind poisoned by Inestrosa, tries to find in the child's features a resemblance to Bianca.¹

¹Act III, Sc. I; Act IV, Sc. II. Mariana tells how the Enríquez family trace their descent from Fadrique and Blanca but that the ancestress of this family is really a Jewess called Paloma (Libro 16, Cap. 18. Ismar again Italianizes rather than Hispanicizes the Latin and gets Palomba). That Don Fadrique, Master of Santiago, was the father of this boy has never been questioned. The identity of the mother has been discussed at length by Floranes ("Vida del Canciller Pero López de Ayala," Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España, XIX, 64 ff.) and many other authors. Ortiz de Zúñiga (op.cit., II, 305), following one of the romances on the subject, believes that La Paloma was merely the foster mother:

"El Maestre de Santiago Don Fadrique, hermano entero y mellizo del Rey Don Henrique II, tuvo a Don Alonso, que por su tío el Rey usó el patronímico Henriquez, en la Reyna Doña Blanca de Borbon, culpa que es ya público en historiadores y genealogistas, haber sido causa de la muerte de ambos, que con menos publicidad no osara referir mi pluma: fió la Reyna el efecto de su delito a Alonso Ortiz, caballero Sevillano, Camarero y valido del Maestre, que tomando el niño con secreto, lo llevó a criar a una Judía casada, que llamaban la Paloma..."

Salazar de Mendoza, quoted by Lomba (p. 40) gives the opinion of Diego Hernández de Mendoza, expressed in his Nobiliario, as the correct one, namely that the mother of the boy was the wife of Fadrique's mayordomo, la Paloma being the foster mother. The whole tradition has been proved by Milá as posterior to Don Pedro's time.

Tamayo y Baus in his play La Ricahembra presents this boy grown up and disdained by the Ricahembra for his bastard origin.

Sources

The main historical source is Mariana. In his Vorrede Ismar gives a brief resumé of Pedro's career, following the great Jesuit historian, with however several errors on his own part. So, for instance, he attributes to Pedro what Mariana says of Alfonso XI, namely that Garcia Lasso, Alvar Osorio and the Jew Astigitan had been appointed as counsellors of the minor king. Again, misinterpreting a possessive, he says the king killed his sisters Juana and Isabel. These are the sisters, not of Pedro, but of the child Nuño de Lara, who had died and whose property the king had appropriated. Ismar had said previously of this same Nuño de Lara, "seine Geliebte rettete ihn," not realizing that he was speaking of a mere child, who was being protected not by a sweetheart but by a guardian. He further mistakes the identity of Blanca's father, calling him Duke of Burgundy instead of Duke of Bourbon. That Ismar had also read Voltaire's Essai sur les Moeurs we see from the fact that he calls Enrico the ancestor of the Spanish house of Hapsburg.¹

In the drama he makes a number of intentional changes in the facts. Such is Pedro's divorce from Blanca, which historically took place to facilitate his marriage to Juana de Castro and is so given by Ismar in his Vorrede. But in the play it is a question of marrying not Juana but a fictitious Leonore or Eleanore² whom he has taken from Voltaire's play. In both the eighteenth century French play and the nineteenth century German one she had

¹Voltaire (op.cit. (1827 ed.), II, Chap. 77.) did not seem to realize that both Enrique and Pedro are the ancestors of that house, Costanza, the second daughter of Pedro and María de Padilla, having married John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, and their daughter Catalina having in turn married Enrique III, grandson of Enrique de Trastamara.

²Ismar writes the name both ways. Historically she was Doña Juana Manuel. Cf. Lomba y Pedraja, op.cit., pp. 282 ff.

been promised to Enrique by his father, Alfonso XI. She belonged to the de la Cerda family, which had been fraudulently shut out from succession to the throne by Sancho IV. Ismar even follows Voltaire in representing Pedro as abducting her from a convent and in giving her a confidante, Elvira, whom however, he omits from the cast of characters. Like Voltaire also, Ismar calls the cor-tes the Senat and introduces many modern ideas concerning the rights of the people, etc. Enrico is here the philosophe, Inestro-sa, the scoffer against the church.

From Shakespeare, Ismar also borrowed freely, taking the sleep-walking scene from Macbeth¹ and the gravedigger scene from Hamlet.² How little known Shakespeare was in Germany at this time is shown by the fact that the reviewer of the play in the Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände³ did not recognize these scenes. This writer criticizes Ismar for his choice of Don Pedro as a hero, saying he is not adapted to artistic treatment, lacking tragische Würde. In poetic worth, needless to say, Ismar's play stands far behind Blanka von Kastilien.

¹Act V, Sc. 2.

²Act V, Sc. 9.

³April 21, 1829.

PART IV

DON PEDRO IN ENGLISH DRAMA

REASONS FOR THE NON-APPEARANCE OF THE SUBJECT
IN THE DRAMA OF THE EARLY PERIOD

In view of the prominent part played by England in the later events of Don Pedro's reign and the rôle of that monarch's descendants in the subsequent history of England itself,¹ one would expect to find the Don Pedro legend occupying a rather conspicuous place in English dramatic literature. This is not the case. In fact, it was not until the Romantic revival of interest in medieval subject matter, that Don Pedro was treated at all.² The Black Prince, who re-established Don Pedro on his throne in 1367, appears as the hero of a number of English dramas of the older period,³ but the authors of these works chose to portray the earlier phase of that leader's campaigns — the battles of Crécy and Poictier — rather than his exploits in Spain. The character of the Black Prince too is such as to make him rather unsuited to dramatic treatment. Where Don Pedro is too infamous,

¹The house of York, one of the contestants in the Wars of the Roses and which came to the throne of England in the person of Edward IV, was descended from Isabel, the third daughter of Don Pedro and María de Padilla. She, together with her sister Costanza, had accompanied her father in his flight to Aquitaine, where she had married Edmund de Langley, first Duke of York. Costanza married John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, and their daughter Catalina became the wife of Enrique III of Castile. A lost play, The Conquest of Spain by John of Gaunt, mentioned in Henslowe's Diary and attributed to Hathway and Rankins, probably treated the Duke of Lancaster's invasion of Spain to establish his right to the Castilian throne, an invasion which led to the marriage arrangement between John of Gaunt's daughter and the grandson of Enrique de Trastamara.

²Enrique de Trastamara figures in a highly fantastic play by W. Smith called Hector of Germany, or the Palsgrave, Prime Elector, written in 1615. He is represented as attempting to make himself emperor of Germany. Genest gives a resumé of this play (The English Stage, X, 95 ff.).

³Roger Boyle (Earl of Orrery), The Black Prince, tragedy,

Prince Edward is too perfect. All the historians of his time expatiate on his virtues. There is not so much as an unhappy or illicit love affair to lend romantic interest to his personality. And so because of his very perfections he has had to step into the background as a dramatic hero and yield first place to his father, Edward III, whose affair with the Countess of Salisbury has made him a favorite subject for dramatists of all nations.¹

The fact that in the midst of the great interest manifested in Spanish literature by the English people of the late sixteenth and the entire seventeenth century, the Spanish drama was entirely neglected, is undoubtedly another reason for the absence of Don Pedro material.² While Spanish characters are found in great number in the plays of the Elizabethan period, they are for the most part fictitious rather than historical personages.

The Nineteenth Century

In the nineteenth century we meet Don Pedro frequently in the novel and in juvenile books where, however, he is usually merely part of the background of the Black Prince, John Chandos, Du Guesclin or other heroes.³ In the drama he is less prominent.⁴

acted 1667; Mrs. Hoper, Edward the Black Prince; or the Battle of Poitiers, 1746; William Shirley, Edward the Black Prince, tragedy (The Battle of Poitiers), 1750.

¹Calderón treated this subject in Amor, honor y poder, using an Italian source (Bandello, Novelle, II, Novella 38), according to Friedrich Schack, Geschichte der dramatischen Literatur und Kunst in Spanien, III, 205.

²Cf. John G. Underhill, Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors, (New York, 1899).

³Sir A. Conan Doyle, The White Company (1890); J.G. Edgar, Cressy and Poitiers; or The Story of the Black Prince's Page (juvenile, 1865); G.A. Henty, St. George for England: a Tale of Cressy and Poitiers (juvenile, 1865); Maurice H. Hervey, Eric the Archer, (juvenile, 1896); Isabel Patterson, The Singing Season; Mary F.N. Roulet, God, The King, my Brother (juvenile); Herbert Strang and Richard Stead, With the Black Prince: a Story of the Reign of Edward III (juvenile, 1907); Charlotte M. Yonge, The Lances of Lynwood (juvenile, 1855). Trueba y Cossío's The Castilian and The Romance of History were originally written in English, as noted.

⁴The British Isles do not offer any translations of Spanish

In fact, there are just two plays on the subject, as in Germany. The first of these was by a Mrs. Attersoll and her work was published not in England but in France.

I

MRS. ATTERSOLL'S PETER THE CRUEL, KING OF
CASTILE AND LEÓN

It is likely that this play was written with a view to its being presented in France. On March 3, 1817, Vincent Valette proposed to the Comte de Pradel the establishment of a foreign theater in France. Valette wished to take charge of it, presenting plays successively at Bordeaux and Paris. Several years later such a theater was actually established in Paris, and plays were performed there in English. This interest in the English drama had been fostered by Mme. de Stael, and Shakespeare now occupied an assured place on the French stage. Lady Morgan had attacked not only the French traditional tragedy but the French manner of declamation as well, and the French dramatists were beginning to feel that they might be able to learn something from the English.²

Mrs. Attersoll wrote a preface to the play in which she expressed her doubts that the work could ever be adequately performed except in her own country:

Don Pedro dramas of the Golden Age until the nineteenth century is pretty well advanced. El médico de su honra, partially translated by Denis Florence McCarthy in the University Magazine, (Dublin, 1848), XXXIV seems to be the first attempt to English one of these plays. Four of the ballads appeared in Lockhart's Spanish Ballads in 1823: The Murder of the Master of Saint Iago (Durán 966), The Death of Queen Blanche (Durán 972), The Death of Don Pedro (Durán 978) and The Proclamation of King Henry (Durán 979). The second of these had already appeared in Blackwood's Magazine in 1820.

¹An historical play in five acts, Angers, printed by L. Pavie, 1818.

²Cf. J.L. Bergerhoff, Le Théâtre anglais à Paris, (Paris, 1912).

"I tremble for my reputation¹ should this piece ever be represented, when I call to mind how near does the extreme of pleasure verge on pain, and how easy it is to make a bold adventurous conception, sink into the ridiculous. In my native country there are histrionic talents to which I could confidently commit the task, certain that my own ideas would be embodied, as thought meets thought."²

Mrs. Attersoll fears "the fiery ordeal of closet criticism." She begs mercy of the "most potent, grave and reverend Censors," her play being written "with an eye rather to the effect than the perfect" and assures them that until they have seen her tragedy on the stage, she will not consider it fairly judged. Her interest, like that of the German dramatists, is in the characters rather than the incidents.

Source

The play is undoubtedly based on Dillon's History of the Reign of Peter the Cruel, King of Castile and León,³ the main source of which is Ayala. Like Dillon, she writes: John of Aragon, brother of Peter;⁴ Aben Zaid and his dying words of reproach to Peter, "Christian thou'st done a sorry deed today,"⁵ which she says in her preface "receive interest from their being those which are recorded of him";⁶ Constance and Beatrice, Peter's daughters; Garcia de Padilla, Maria's brother. She abbreviates his Inigo

¹Whatever this "reputation" may have been, it did not survive the test of time.

²Kean at Drury Lane was one of the most famous of the English actors of the time. Mrs. Siddons retired the year following the publication of the Attersoll play. John Kemble withdrew in 1817, but his brother Charles, who also achieved a great reputation, was in his prime. Macready was another great actor just becoming prominent. What wonder that the author of Peter the Cruel felt that her play could be ably presented in her own country!

³(London, 1788).

⁴He was historically Don Pedro's cousin. His mother, Doña Leonor, sister to Alfonso XI, had married the king of Aragon.

⁵Act IV, Sc. 1.

⁶Dillon translates Ayala's "¡Oh qué pequeña caballería feciste!" (Año 13, Cap. 6) as "Oh, Christian, thou hast done a sorry deed this day!" (I, 189).

Ortis de Estuniga¹ to Inigo. In changing John Perez de Reboledo to Perez Lobo, she chooses a name which she considers appropriate to his rôle. This is the only indication that Mrs. Attersoll knew any Spanish. Her Gutierre Novaldes in the cast of characters — elsewhere she writes merely Gutierre — may be an error due to the French publisher, as such a form appears in none of the well-known histories of Don Pedro's reign, and as, moreover, the play presents many other misprints. Dillon has transformed Ayala's Suer Gutierrez de Navales² to Gutierre Navales. Mrs. Attersoll also follows Dillon in attributing Peter's motive in planning Blanca's death to his desire to pave Maria's way to the throne.³ Later his suspicion regarding Blanche and Frederick adds a further incentive. This too is to be traced to Dillon, who mentions Voltaire as accusing Blanche of such a liaison but himself discredits the story. Mrs. Attersoll accordingly represents the accusation as being unfounded.

Characteristics of the Play

Mrs. Attersoll's treatment of the subject is rather original. She too is interested in a psychological study of the characters. Maria, whose death historically takes place soon after the murder of Blanca, is here depicted as dying of a broken heart in consequence of that crime, which climaxes the previous killings of Aben Zaid and the Master of St. James. Maria had been secretly married to Peter before his marriage to Blanche, whom he had espoused merely for her dowry. Maria, in order to induce Blanche to flee with Frederick, shows her her own marriage certificate, a

¹Ayala has Iñigo Ortiz de Estuñiga (Año 12, Cap. 3)

²Año 9, Cap. 3.

³Act II, Sc. 2; Dillon, I, 180.

melodramatic touch.¹ The escape is of course frustrated by the villains, who are in this play Maria's brother, Padilla, the usual villain of Don Pedro drama, and the less frequent John of Aragon.²

The killing of the Moor Aben Zaid occupies a prominent place in this play and helps to bring out Peter's covetousness, which here is his chief characteristic. It is natural that an English writer should have dwelt on this aspect of his nature. The failure of the Black Prince to recover the money Don Pedro had promised him in return for his assistance naturally is conspicuous in English accounts of the events of the time. That Don Pedro was of a grasping disposition we know from the testimony of Spanish historians also.³

II

LORD PORCHESTER'S DON PEDRO, KING OF CASTILE

In 1828, Don Pedro was again made the protagonist of an English tragedy, this time by Henry John George Herbert, Lord Porchester. The play was presented at the Drury Lane Theater on March 10 with Macready in the rôle of Henry of Trastamar. According to the editor, the piece was well received, for he says in the preface:

"The flattering success which this piece has met with on its first representation at Drury Lane, has emboldened the

¹Part of this scene was omitted through an error on the part of the publisher.

²According to Ayala (Año 9, Cap. 2), whose account of the matter is followed by Dillon, Don Pedro requested the Infante Don Juan de Aragón to help him kill the Maestre, and he eagerly agreed. However, in Ayala Don Juan is not present at the actual murder and shortly after is himself put to death by the king. In representing Don John as having designs on the Castilian throne Mrs. Atter-soll is giving him some of the attributes of his older brother, Don Ferrando, who was mentioned as a possible successor to Don Pedro at the time of the king's illness.

³Ayala, Año 20, Cap. 8.

friends of the absent author¹ to present it to the public, hoping it will meet with as favourable a reception from its readers."

The play, however, did not continue to hold a place on the boards, whatever may have been its original success.

Like De Belloy and others, Lord Porchester presents Blanc and Henry as lovers, a situation which is the natural outcome of the Old French sources, where Enrique is the chief defender of the queen. Don Pedro had seen the French princess for the first time on the day when she was to marry Henry, had become enamoured of her and had displaced his brother as bride-groom, only to tire of his bride soon afterwards. María de Padilla is again the arch villainess who rouses the king's wrath against his wife by false accusations concerning her relations to Trastamar. With the aid of the Jew, Raban, who hates Blanche for her contumelious treatment of him, she succeeded in having the queen condemned to death. Raban however, learning that María had inscribed his name too on her list of victims, by neglecting to purchase the aid of the Moors brings about Don Pedro's defeat. The king is killed by Henry, who returns to the Alcázar in time to see both María and Blanche succumb to a poisonous potion.

Sources

The chief source of this work is the Cuvelier chronicle or one of its derivatives. As in Cuvelier, Blanche's death is the direct result of the hatred she inspired in a certain Jew by her contemptuous treatment of him. The name of the Jew, Raban, is however invented by the author, for Cuvelier does not give it. In the case of the executioner, Daniot, Lord Porchester has taken both the name and the office from his source. There the man has

¹He was in Spain at the time.

a confederate, Turquant, who admits both his own guilt and Daniot's to Henri:

"Sire, ce dit Turquant, ne vous celeraï mie,
Par le Dieu qui je croi que tout a en baillie,
Moi et Daniot sommes tout d'une confrarie,
Et a esté par nous la dame murdrrie
Et V autres Juifs qui droit ci ne sont mie.¹

To this source also is due the feeling on the part of Don Pedro that he must put Blanche out of the way secretly. He says to Daniot at the beginning of Act III:

"For in this factious time it were not good
That any tell-tale drops of blood should rise
To make dread question - even those livid spots,
That stain the cheek of death, when subtle poison
Has stolen into the house of life, show foully,
And must not by the common eye be looked on."

In Cuvellier we read:

'Morir convient la dame, plus on n'y attendra;
Mais je voudroie bien, ja celle ne sera,
C'on ne peust savoir dont telle mort vendra."²

The important part played by Ferrand de Castro points also to the Old French sources, but Castro's daughter, Clara, is the invention of the dramatist. She is presented as the queen's companion in prison.

It is possible that Henri's journey to Aragon, disguised as a pilgrim, as related by Cuvellier,³ may have given Lord Porches-ter the idea of having him visit Blanche in the garb of a father confessor.⁴ As for the pass-word, Coimbra, which he utters to gain admittance, this was probably suggested by the ballad, Yo me estaba allá en Coimbra, which was one of the Don Pedro ballads translated by Lockhart.

The Merlin prophecy, related in a minstrel song in Act IV,

¹Op.cit., I, l. 10289 ff.

²Ibid., I, p. 251, note ff.

³Ibid., l. 12692-13155.

⁴Act II, Sc. 3.

is also prominent in Cuvelier.¹ So too is the magic potion supposed to have been given the king by his mistress, although there the lady in question is not María de Padilla but la dame de Castres.² In Don Pedro it is merely hinted at.³

In calling one of the troubadours at Henry's camp, Blondel, Lord Porchester was probably thinking of the famous twelfth century minstrel who is said to have rescued Richard Coeur de Lion when he was imprisoned in the dungeon of Dürrenstein, an incident which has become a motif of world literature.

General Characteristics

As Genest remarks,⁴ the characters of María, Pedro and Ra-ban are well drawn. Maria, while a thoroughly heartless and unscrupulous creature, has one virtue, her courage. She stops at no means to attain her ends, and when she realizes her defeat, takes poison rather than lose her freedom. True to her nature to the end, she gloats over Henry's grief at Blanche's death and longs for one more hour to enjoy it. She expresses her strength of purpose in the following words:

"I
Have stedfastly pursued the path to greatness;
Nothing repenting, nothing yielding, neither
Precipitating nor deferring aught
That headlong zeal or female fears, might have
Urged rashly forward or too long delayed."⁵

This picture of her is completely at variance with Ayala's estimate of her character but is quite a logical presentation for an author

¹Lord Porchester gives the following note on this prophecy: "There existed an ancient tradition in Spain, that Merlin had prophesied that a falcon should come from the land of the setting sun who would bring ruin to a King of Spain. The falcon was the crest of Bertrand du Guesclin, to whom the prophecy was applied."

²See p. 49, note 6.

³Act I, Sc. 2.

⁴Op.cit., IX, 415 ff.

⁵Act I, Sc. 1.

using a French source.

Blanca is again the personification of long-suffering virtue, who loving Henry is yet faithful to Pedro.

There are many improbable situations, such as Blanche's abduction by Raban and Daniot, who appear in disguise in a boat at the foot of her tower.

Espronceda and Lord Porchester

It is very likely that Espronceda knew Lord Porchester's play. Certain resemblances between the Spanish Blanca de Borbón and the English Don Pedro and the fact that Espronceda was in London at the time Lord Porchester's play was presented make it extremely probable. In both plays we have Blanca and Enrique enamored of each other and Blanca nevertheless remaining faithful to Don Pedro; in both, María de Padilla and Pedro are thoroughly heartless persons; in both, Enrique visits Blanca in prison disguised in clerical garb; in both, Blanca's companion is the daughter of the governor of her prison;¹ in both, Enrique plans to rescue Blanca with the aid of his adherents and carry her off to France; in both, Aguilar is one of Enrique's confederates; in both, a knight appears in a boat at the foot of Blanca's tower, and Blanca is informed of his presence by the strains of a harp.² Even Pedro's and María's consultation of the astrologer in his cavern in Lord Porchester's play has its counterpart in Espronceda's where they visit the maga in her cave. There are many differences between the two works as well, due to the fact that Espronceda wrote the last three acts of his play after his return to Spain,

¹Espronceda corrected Lord Porchester's historical error of making her Fernando de Castro's daughter.

²That in Espronceda this knight is really Enrique, not the villain in disguise, is a minor difference.

that he had considerable knowledge of the Spanish historical sources and that he was a great poet who did not imitate slavishly.

Absence of Spanish Traditional Elements
in English Drama

As in German, so in English drama the legendary elements which we usually associate with Don Pedro el Cruel are entirely absent, and in England too this is due to the fact that the Spanish Don Pedro plays were unknown. As we have seen, one of the English plays drew on a Spanish historical source — through the medium of an English one, to be sure — the other on a French source. Therefore, the lack of common elements.

CONCLUSION

The international literary influences that come to light in studying the plays written around Peter the Cruel in France, Germany and England are slight. From Spain to France, we have a thread of connection between Hoz y Mota and Arnault and perhaps another between Arnault and Matos Fragoso. In the nineteenth century, Trueba y Cossio exerted an undoubted influence. From France to Germany we have an unquestioned influence in Ismar's borrowing from Voltaire. Even Grillparzer, while his own treatment is entirely original, may have been led to choose the subject because the great French author had written a play on it. There may possibly be another thread of connection leading from France to England — from De Belloy to Lord Porchester. However, there is no evidence to prove this other than the situation — Enrique in love with Blanca — which, as has been stated, is one that would naturally develop from the Old French sources. The practically certain influence of Lord Porchester on Espronceda has already been pointed out.

As regards the manner of treatment, there is great divergence due to the multiplicity of the sources utilized. No distinctly national peculiarities are discernible, except in the character of Blanca. The non-existence of the Blanca-Fadrique scandal in the French drama and its extreme scarcity in the Spanish is undoubtedly traceable to patriotic reasons. Such considerations, to be sure, would not have restrained Voltaire, always eager to overthrow pre-conceived acceptations. But his object was to rehabilitate Don Pedro, and he felt that this could be done more effectively by leaving Blanca out of the picture entirely. In Germany, the

liaison is presented as a fact in the one instance, and in the other it is mentioned as a false rumor simply because Mariana represents it thus. As for the other personages, they vary according to the source utilized. The treatment of Don Pedro himself was favorable in France for the most part, perhaps due to the influence of Voltaire; in fact, De Belloy is the only French author who makes him absolutely black. In Germany and England too he is usually not presented as entirely depraved but merely as weak and vacillating, the dupe of unprincipled courtiers.

As has been mentioned before, there is only a slight trace of the Justiciero conception of him, the Cabeza del Rey Don Pedro and the Juan Pascual tradition left in the French drama, while in Germany and England even these elements have entirely disappeared. The María Coronel legend has not found its way even across the Pyrenees. The story of the magic girdle, on the other hand, is absent in Spain and appears in France — though, to be sure, in only one isolated instance.

At the time of Señor Lomba y Pedraja's article on El Rey Don Pedro en el teatro, he promised a future study on the treatment of the subject in the field of art. It is to be hoped that he has not given up this project, for, as he says, las artes del diseño played their part in popularizing the figure of the king and a consideration of that phase of the Don Pedro legend would be of great value as an aid to arriving at a complete conception of him.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Don Pedro Plays

- Arnault, Antoine Vincent, "Don Pèdre, ou Le roi et le laboureur," Oeuvres, (Paris, 1824-27), II.
- Attersoll, Mrs., Peter the Cruel, King of Castile and León, (Angers, 1818).
- Belloy, Pierre de, Pierre le Cruel, (Paris, 1780).
- Calderón de la Barca, Pedro, "El médico de su honra," partially translated by Denis Florence McCarthy, University Magazine, (Dublin, 1848).
- Claramonte, Andrés de, "De este agua no beberé," Biblioteca de autores españoles desde la formación del lenguaje hasta nuestros días, (Madrid, 1846-1906), XLIII.
- Cormon et E. Grange, Don Pèdre, Opéra-Comique en trois actes, musique de M. Ferdinand Poise, (Paris, 1857).
- D.P.M.N.D.E., La crueldad en el throno. Ms. at Biblioteca Colombina, (Seville, n.d.). No. 63-3-5.
- Grillparzer, Franz, "Blanka von Kastilien," Werke, ed. Sauer, (Vienna, 1909-), II Abt. I bd.
- Herbert, Henry John George, Lord Porchester, Don Pedro, King of Castile, (London, 1828).
- Hoz y Mota, Juan de la, "El montañés Juan Pascual," B.A.E., (Madrid, 1901), XLIX.
- Íñiguez, José María, Doña Blanca, (Madrid, 1806).
- Ismer, F., König Pedro. Trauerspiel in fünf Akten, (Hamburg, 1829).
- Labrousse, F., and Brette, Louis-Nicolas, dit Saint-Ernest, Don Pèdre le Mendiant, (Paris, 1837).
- Villaespesa, Francisco, Doña María de Padilla, (Madrid, 1915).
- Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de, "Don Pèdre," Oeuvres complètes, (Kehl, 1785-89 ed.), VI.

Historical Works

- Amador de los Ríos, José, Historia de los judíos de España, (Madrid, 1876 ed.), II.
- Baluze, Étienne, "Prima vita Innocentii VI." Vitae paparum Aveniensium, (Paris, 1693). Nouv.ed. d'après les manuscrits par G. Mollat, (Paris, 1914).
- Biographie Universelle, (Paris, 1823 ed.).
- Bosquet, François, Pontificum romanorum, qui e Gallia oriundi in ea sederunt, historia ab anno Christi 1305 ad annum 1394 ..., (Paris, 1632).
- Castillo, Julián del, Historia de los reyes godos, (Madrid, 1624 ed.).
- Catalina García, Juan, Historia general de España, (Madrid, 1891).
- Chasles, Ph., "De Don Pèdre, roi de Castille, surnommé El Cruel, El Justiciero, El Necesitado, et du chroniqueur Don Lopez Ayala, contemporain de ce prince," Revue de Paris, (Paris,

- 1829), pp. 255 ff.
- "Crónica de Don Alfonso el Onceno," B.A.E., LXVI.
- Cuarta Crónica General: 1. "Crónica de España del Arzobispo Don Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada. Tradújola en castellano y la continuó hasta su tiempo Don Gonzalo de la Hinojosa, obispo de Burgos, y después un anónimo hasta el año de 1454," Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España, (1893), CVI; 2. "Sumario de los reyes de España por el despensero mayor de la reyna doña Leonor, muger del rey don Juan el primero de Castilla," Colección de las crónicas y memorias de los reyes de Castilla, (Madrid, 1781), III. Published by D. Eugenio de Llaguno Amírola.
- Cuvelier, "Chronique de Bertrand du Guesclin," par Cuvelier, trouvère du XIV^e siècle. Publiée par E. Charrière, (Paris, 1839), Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, 1^{re} série.
- Daumet, Georges, Innocent VI et Blanche de Bourbon, (Paris, 1899).
- Dillon, John Talbot, The History of the Reign of Peter the Cruel, king of Castile and Leon, (London, 1788). French translation: Histoire de Pierre le Cruel, roi de Castille et de Leon... Traduite par Mlle Froidure de Rezelle, (Paris, 1790).
- Ferreras, Johann von, ...Allgemeine Historie von Spanien..., (Halle, 1754-1772); Juan de Ferreras, Histoire Générale d'Espagne, traduite de l'espagnol... par M. d'Hermilly, (Paris, 1751).
- Floranes, Rafael de, "Vida literaria del Canciller mayor de Castilla D. Pedro López de Ayala," Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España, (1851), XIX.
- Froissart, Jean, "Chroniques," publiées par le baron Kervyn de Lettenhove, Oeuvres de Froissart, (Brussels, 1867-1877), VII.
- Gracia Dei, Pedro de, "Historia del Rey D. Pedro y su descendencia, que es el linage de las dos Castillas," Semanario Erudito, (Madrid, 1788), XXVIII and XXIX.
- Guthrie, William, Gray, John, and others, A General History of the World, from the Creation to the Present Time, (London, 1764-67). Allgemeine Weltgeschichte... ausgefertigt von W.G. Gray, und andern..., (Leipzig, 1765-1808).
- Le Febvre, Jacques, Anciens Mémoires du XIV^e siècle... où l'on apprend les aventures les plus surprenantes... de la vie du fameux Bertrand Du Guesclin, (Douay, 1692).
- López de Ayala, Pedro, "Crónica del rey don Pedro... con las encomiendas del secretario Gerónimo Zurita, y las correcciones y notas añadidas por don Eugenio de Llaguno y Amírola," B.A.E., (Madrid, 1875), LXVI.
- Mal-Lara, Juan de, Recibimiento que hizo Sevilla al Rey D. Philippe, (Seville, 1570).
- Mariana, Juan de, "Obras," ed. Francisco Pi y Margall, B.A.E., (Madrid, 1854), XXX; Histoire générale d'Espagne, tr. en français, avec des notes et des cartes, par le P. Joseph-Nicolas Charenton, (Paris, 1725).
- Mérimée, Prosper, Histoire de D. Pèdre, roi de Castille, (Paris, 1865 ed.).
- Ortiz de Zúñiga, Diego, Anales eclesiásticos y seculares de la... ciudad de Sevilla..., (Madrid, 1795-96 ed.), II.
- Raynaldi, Odorico, Annales ecclesiastici ab anno 1198, ubi desinit Baronius, auctore Odorico Raynaldo, (Romae, 1646-77).
- Sitges, Juan B., Las mujeres del Rey Don Pedro I de Castilla, (Madrid, 1910).

- Spalding, K.A.W., Peter der Grausame, König von Kastilien, (Berlin, 1797).
- Vera y Figueroa, Juan Antonio de, Conde de la Roca, El rei D. Pedro defendido, (Madrid, 1647).
- Vergil, Polydore, Urbínatis Anglicae historiae libri viginti-septem, (Basileae, 1555).
- Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de, Essai sur les Moeurs, (Paris, 1827 ed.), II.
- Wadding, Luke, Annales minorum, (Rome, 1731-).

Critical Works

- Borgerhoff, J.L., Le Théâtre anglais à Paris, (Paris, 1912).
- Bouterwek, Friedrich, Geschichte der Poesie und Beredsamkeit seit dem Ende des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts, (Göttingen, 1801-19), III.
- Cañete, Manuel, Escritores españoles e hispano-americanos, (Madrid, 1884).
- Cirot, Georges, "Le témoignage de López de Ayala au sujet de D. Fadrique, frère de Pierre-le-Cruel," Hispania, (Paris, 1922), V.
- Cotarelo y Mori, Emilio, Isidoro Maiquez y el teatro de su tiempo, (Madrid, 1902).
- Díaz de Escovar, Narciso, y Lasso de la Vega, Francisco de P., Historia del teatro español, (Barcelona, 1924), II.
- Entwistle, William J., "The 'Romancero del Rey Don Pedro' in Ayala and the 'Cuarta Crónica General'," Modern Language Review, (London, 1930), XXV.
- Friedrich, Ernst, "Die Magie im französischen Theater des XVI und XVII Jahrhunderts," Münchener Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie, (Leipzig, 1908), XLI.
- Gassier, Alfred, Le Théâtre espagnol, (Paris, 1898).
- Gautier, Théophile, Histoire de l'art dramatique en France depuis vingt-cinq ans, (Paris, 1858-59).
- Genest, John, Some account of the English Stage, (Bath, 1832), X.
- Keidel, Heinrich, Historische Quellen, literarische Vorlagen und Anregungen zu den dramatischen Versuchen des jungen Grillparzer, Dissertation, (Münster, 1911).
- Lacey, Alexander, Pixerécourt and the French Romantic Drama, (Toronto, 1928).
- Lanson, Gustave, "Études sur les rapports de la littérature française et de la littérature espagnole au XVII^e siècle," Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, (Paris, 1896), III.
- Latour, Antoine de, Études sur l'Espagne, (Paris, 1855).
- Lomba y Pedraja, José R., "El Rey Don Pedro en el teatro," Homenaje a Menéndez y Pelayo en el año vigésimo de su profesorado, (Madrid, 1899), II.
- Martinenche, E., L'Espagne et le Romantisme, (Paris, 1922).
- Menéndez Pidal, Ramón, El Romancero, (Madrid, 1928).
- Menéndez y Pelayo, Marcelino, Antología de poetas líricos castellanos desde la formación del idioma hasta nuestros días ..., (Madrid, 1890-); Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega, (Madrid, 1923 ed.), IV.
- Morley, S. Griswold, "Ya anda la de Mazagatos, comedia desconocida atribuida a Lope de Vega," Bulletin Hispanique, (Bordeaux, 1923 and 1924), XXV and XXVI.
- Petit de Julleville, Louis, Le Théâtre en France, (Paris, 1889).

- Pitou, Alexis, "Les Origines du Mélodrame français à la fin du XVIII^e siècle," Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, (Paris, 1911), XVIII.
- Restori, A., review of Obras de Lope de Vega publicadas por la Real Academia Española, vol. IX, X, Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, (Halle, 1905), XXIX.
- Rigal, Eugène, Victor Hugo, (Paris, 1900).
- Schack, Adolf Friedrich, Geschichte der dramatischen Literatur und Kunst in Spanien, (Berlin, 1845-46).
- Soubies, Albert, La Comédie-Française depuis l'Époque Romantique, (Paris, 1895).
- Torre y Franco-Romero, Lucas de, "Las bodas del Rey D. Pedro de Castilla," Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, (Madrid, 1909), XX.
- Underhill, John G., Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors, (New York, 1899).

Other Citations

- Alfonsi, P., Disciplina Clericalis. Zum ersten mal herausgegeben mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen von F.W.V. Schmidt, etc., (Berlin, 1827).
- Arolas, Juan, Poesías, edición y prólogo por José R. Lomba y Pedraja, (Madrid, Ediciones de "La Lectura," 1928).
- Bandello, Matteo, La prima [-quarta] parte del Bandello, (London, 1791-93), II, Novella 38.
- Bertuch, Friedrich J., Magazin, (Weimar, 1789 ed.).
- Collé, Charles, La Partie de Chasse de Henri IV, (Paris, 1766).
- Collot d'Herbois, J.M., Le Paysan magistrat, (Paris, 1780).
- Dodsley, Robert, Choix de petites pièces du théâtre anglais... [par Dodsley et Gay], (Paris, 1756).
- Dumas, Alexandre, Le Bâtard de Mauléon, (Paris, 1877).
- " " Isabel de Bavière [Praxide. Pierre le Cruel]. (Paris, 1850).
- " " Mémoires, (Brussels, 1852).
- " " Souvenirs dramatiques et littéraires, (Paris, 1928 ed.).
- Durán, Agustín, "Romancero general...," B.A.E., (Madrid, 1854), X, XVI.
- Erizzo, Sebastiano, "Le Sei Giornate," Novellieri Minori del Cinquecento a cura di Giuseppe Gigli e Fausto Nicolini, (Bari, 1912).
- Feijóo y Montenegro, Benito Jerónimo, Theatro crítico universal... (Madrid, 1758-63), II.
- Fernández y González, Manuel, Doña María Coronel. Episodio del reinado de don Pedro el Cruel, (Madrid, 1875?).
- Gesta Romanorum, Wynnard Hooper ed., Swann translation, (London, 1904).
- Giraldi Cintio, Giovanni Battista, Hecatommiti, ouero cento novelle..., (Venice, 1608 ed.), Dec. Prima, Nov. IX.
- Gracián, Baltasar, El Criticón, ed. Cejador y Frauca, (Madrid, n.d.).
- Grillparzer, Franz, Selbstbiographie, published by Ludwig Boeck and William Englmann, (Vienna, 1923).
- "Tagebücher und literarische Skizzenhefte," Sämmtliche Werke, ed. Sauer, (Vienna, 1909-).
- Henslowe's Diary, ed. Walter W. Greg, (London, 1904-08).
- Herder, Johann Gottfried von, Volkslieder, (Leipzig, 1778-79).

- La Beaumelle, Victor de, Chefs d'oeuvre du théâtre espagnol, (Paris, 1823).
- Legrand, Marc Antoine, Le Roy de Cocagne, (Paris, 1719).
- Linguet, Simon Nicolas Henri, Théâtre espagnol..., (Paris, 1770).
- Lockhart, John Gibson, Ancient Spanish Ballads, (Edinburgh, 1823).
- Montoto y Rautenstrauch, Luis, Personajes, personas y personillas que corren por las tierras de ambas Castillas, (Seville, 1911-12).
- Moratín, Leandro Fernández de, "Catálogo de las piezas dramáticas publicadas en España desde el principio del siglo XVIII hasta la época presente," B.A.E., (Madrid, 1898), II, 328 ff.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques, Confessions, (Paris, 1911 ed.)
- Sanchez de Vercial, Climente, "Libro de los exemplos," ed. Gayangos, B.A.E., (Madrid, 1857), LI.
- Santa Cruz, Melchor de, Floresta española..., (Brussels, 1614 ed.).
- Schlegel, August Wilhelm von, Spanisches Theater, (Berlin, 1803-09)
- Sedaine, Michel Jean, Le Roi et le Fermier, (Paris, 1762).
- Trueba y Cossío, Joaquín Telesforo, Romance of History, (London, 1830). French edition: L'Espagne romantique, contes de l'Histoire d'Espagne, traduit par Ch.A. Defaucompret, (Paris, 1832).
- Vega Carpio, Lope Felix de, El peregrino en su patria, (Madrid, 1608 ed.).
- Obras de Lope de Vega, publicadas por la Real Academia Española, (Madrid, 1916-).
- Velasco y Pimentel, Bernardino, "Deleyte de la Discrecion y Facil Escuela de la Agudeza," (Madrid, 1743), Floresta general, (Madrid, 1910-11), II.
- Vélez de Guevara, Luis, "Reinar después de la muerte," B.A.E., XLV.
- Zorrilla, José, Recuerdos del tiempo viejo, (Madrid, 1882), I.

Periodicals

- Almanach des Muses, (Paris, 1766-).
- Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, (Edinburgh, 1858).
- Memorial Literario, Instructivo y Curioso de la Corte de Madrid, etc., (Madrid, 1784-85).
- Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände, (Tübingen, 1807-65).
- Revue de Paris, (Paris, 1829-).
- Semanario Erudito, que comprende varias obras inéditas, críticas, morales, instructivas, políticas, historicas, satiricas, y jocosas de nuestros mejores autores... Dalas a luz...A. Valladares de Sotomayor, (Madrid, 1788).

APPENDIX

Additional Don Pedro Plays Not Discussed in This Work

Spanish:

- Iglesias, Pedro Antonio, D. Pedro I de Castilla, drama histórico en cuatro actos, original y en verso, (Madrid, 1859).
- Suárez Villegas, D. Juan, El Rey Pedro I y los conjurados, drama en cuatro actos para representarse en el Teatro de Variedades el año de 1855, (Madrid, 1856).
- Zavaleta, Miguel (born 1833), Amor, drama en tres actos y en verso. Ms. 160 pp. Has to do with love of D. Pedro and María de Padilla and opposition of the queen, Leonor, and Albuquerque--Roselló, Biblioteca de escritores bañeares.

French:

- Ancelot, Jacques, María Padilla, (Paris, 1834), tragedy, 5 a.--given at Comédie Française, Oct. 29, 1838.
- Ancelot, Jacques and Lucas, Hippolyte, Marie Padilla, opéra en 4 actes, musique de M. G. Donizetti, (Paris, 1843).
- Borde, Charles, "Blanche de Bourbon," tragedy, 5 a., Oeuvres diverses de M. Borde, (Lyon, 1783).
- Monsieur Le Roux, Le triomphe de l'amour ou Don Père de Castille, verse, (Paris, 1722)--Soleinne catalogue.
- Rosier, M., María Padilla, (Paris, 1834). Presented at the Théâtre du Vaudeville, Paris, 1837.

